21952

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR. INDUPURU .... INDIRAVATHI ... REDDY

TITLE OF THESIS. DECISION ... MAKING ... POWER ... OF MIDDLE ... INCOME .... COUPLES .... IN A LARGE ... CANADIAN ... CITY ....

UNIVERSITY ... OF .... ALBERTA ....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED ... M. Sc .... FAMILY STUDIES

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED ... 1974 ... FALL ....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed). I. Indiravathi Reddy

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

101, 10625 - 81 Ave
EDMONTON ....
.... T6E 1Y1

DATED. 8th Oct 1974

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DECISION MAKING POWER OF MIDDLE INCOME COUPLES IN A LARGE CANADIAN CITY

by

© INDUPURU INDIRAVATHI REDDY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN
FAMILY STUDIES

SCHOOL OF HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Decision Making Power of Middle Income Couples in a Large Canadian City," submitted by INDUPURU INDIRAVATHI REDDY in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Doris R Badir

Supervisor

Dianne L Kieren

ASA Mohsen

Dated October 4, 1974.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify the factors influencing the power relations of marital pairs. The expectations from the literature were that power relations of husbands and wives depend on variables such as comparative educational status, income and occupational status . Consideration was given to possible conceptual and methodological improvements over past research in this area. The data was obtained through interviews and an hypothetical decision making situation, for the purpose of obtaining the perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral scores from husbands and wives. The sample consisted of a total of 100 subjects (50 husbands and their wives). Controls were placed on the sample in order to study intact middle income families married between 5 to 10 years having no adolescent children.

Using the 0.05 level of significance, chi square tests were conducted to test the impact of the above mentioned variables on spousal power relations.

The findings of this study suggested a very high significant relationship ($P < 0.01$) between the comparative educational status of a husband and his power in decision making. Husbands having higher occupational status than their wives in the study were found to enjoy significantly ($P < 0.05$) more power in the decision making process. In

addition, a clear trend was noted in the direction of a husband earning greater income than his wife to enjoy more power in marital decision making. Sixty nine percent of husbands whose incomes were greater than their wives reported that they make most of the decisions in their households.

Similarly, a highly significant relationship ($P < 0.01$) was noted between the comparative educational status of a wife and her power in making decisions. A clear trend was noted in the direction of a wife earning less income or having a lower occupational status than her husband to enjoy less power in making decisions. Seventy eight per cent of the wives having lower occupational status than their husbands in the study reported a traditional pattern of decision making. Similarly 71 per cent of the wives earning less income than their husbands reported that their husbands dominate the decision process.

A direct positive relationship ($P < 0.05$) was noted between the frequency of attending the organizations and the husband's power in making decisions.

The data failed to show any significant relationship ($P > 0.9$) between the age of a husband and his power in decision making.

Husbands in the study were found to enjoy slightly more

power than their wives. Two decisions were primarily the husband's province (car and insurance), two the wife's (food and doctor) and two were joint decisions (house and vacation). While a majority of the husbands were not influenced by their wives in making decisions regarding their jobs, they, however, influenced their wives in making these decisions.

The analysis of Spearman's rank order correlation indicated that there was a highly significant ($P < 0.001$) amount of agreement between a husband's and his wife's perceptions of family power.

The research indicated that there was no relationship between perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral power on the part of either husbands or wives.

The study brought forth several implications for future research in the area of family power in the direction of methodological improvements.

PREFACE

As a student of family studies, the writer became aware of the controversies over family power structure which appear in the literature. It also was evident to the author, that the equalitarian values of North American Society were not necessarily practiced in interaction among family members. Intrigued with statements such as "The equalitarian family norm is a myth; equal power we don't have, and equal power we will never get,women as a group are discriminated against from achieving power in families." (Gillespie, 1971); and by comments on the methodological shortcomings of research on family power, the author launched on the development of a research project in the area of family power to gain a better understanding of it. In accomplishing this objective the author received help from several individuals and would like to acknowledge their interest in this research.

The author wishes to express her deep appreciation to MS. DORIS R. BADIR for her helpful advice and supervision throughout the undertaking of this study. Thanks are due to DR. D. K. KIEREN, DR. A. S. A. MOHSEN and DR. L. E. LARSON for their scholarly suggestions and timely advice. The co-operation and interest shown by MR. M. COOK in the study, is thankfully acknowledged. The author is indebted to the fellow graduate students who assisted her in interviewing the subjects. The willingness to participate and the time given by the subjects is very much appreciated. Last but not least the author wishes to express her thanks to her husband, DR. I. K. REDDY, but for whose co-operation, help and encouragement the author would not have been able to complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I INTRODUCTION 1

A. THE PROBLEM 2

B. THE NEED FOR THE STUDY 2

C. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 3

D. THE BASIC QUESTIONS 4

E. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 5

F. PLAN OF THE STUDY 5

II REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON FAMILY POWER 7

A. THE NATURE OF POWER 8

B. POWER DEFINED 9

C. TYPES OF POWER 11

D. OPERATIONALIZING POWER 11

E. POWER STRUCTURE OF FAMILIES 13

F. THEORIES OF FAMILY POWER 14

1. Resource Theory 15

2. Exchange Theory 16

3. Role Theory 17

III CONCEPTUAL AND METHODLOGICAL ISSUES: CRITICAL REVIEW 18

A. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES 18

B. METHODLOGICAL ISSUES 20

1. Dependancy on One Family Member's Responses 20

2. Exclusive Reliance on Survey Techniques 23
3. Calculation of Overall Decision Making Score 27
4. Problems of Comparability of Data ... 29
C. SUMMARY 31
IV RESEARCH PROCEDURES 33
A. THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE STUDY OF MARITAL POWER 33
Resource Theory 33
B. METHODOLOGY 36
1. Hypotheses 37
2. Definitions of Terms 38
(a) Power 38
(b) Attitudes 39
(c) Perception 39
(d) Behaviour 40
3. The Sample 41
4. Instruments Used 44
(a) Interview Schedule 45
Blood and Wolfe's (1960) Task Participation Index and Role Specialization Index 45
Blood and Hamblin's (1958) Decision Power Index 46
Dunn's (1960) Authority Sub-scale 47
(b) The Game 49

5. Data Collection 51

6. Statistical Analysis of Data 53

V ANALYSIS OF DATA 55

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF FAMILIES STUDIED 55

B. TESTS OF HYPOTHESES 57

HYPOTHESIS - 1 57

Results 57

Discussions 58

HYPOTHESIS - 2 61

Results 61

Discussions 63

HYPOTHESIS - 3 65

Results 65

Discussions 67

HYPOTHESIS - 4 69

Results 69

Discussions 70

HYPOTHESIS - 5 72

Results 72

Discussions 74

HYPOTHESIS - 6 75

Results 75

Discussions 77

HYPOTHESIS - 7 80

Results 80

Discussions 81

HYPOTHESIS - 8 84

Results 84

Discussions 90

VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 92

A. SUMMARY 92

B. CONCLUSIONS 93

C. LIMITATIONS 94

D. IMPLICATIONS 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY 99

APPENDICES 110

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I Relationship between comparative educational status of a husband and his power in decision making 59

II Relationship between comparative educational status of a wife and her power in decision making 59

III Relationship between coparative occupational status of a husband and his power in decision making 62

IV Relationship between comparative occupational status of a wife and her power in decision making 62

V Relationship between the comparative annual income of a husband and the power enjoyed by him in decision making 66

VI Relationship between the comparative annual income of a wife and the power enjoyed by her in decision making 66

VII Relationship between the frequency of attending the organizations and the power enjoyed by husbands in decision making 71

VIII Relationship between husband's age and his power in decision making 73

IX Percentages of spousal views of power related to decision making situations 76

X The pattern of giving in as per husbands and wives responses 82

XI Percentage comparision between the perceptual and attitudinal power scores of husbands and wives 85

XII Comparision between the behavioral and perceived power relations of husbands and wives 87

XIII Coparision between the behavioral and perceived power relations of husbands and wives 87

XIV Comparision between the behavioral and attitudinal power relations of husbands and wives 89

XV Comparision between the behavioral and attitudinal power relations of husbands and wives 89

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
I	LETTER DESCRIBING THE STUDY	110
II	PRILIMINARY SURVEY FORM	112
III	REMAINDER	114
IV	INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	115
V	THE GAME	132
VI	BALES INTERACTION PROCESS CATEGORIES	133
VII	PRE-TEST	135
VIII	THE GAME AS EXPLAINED TO COUPLES	138
IX	RULES	139
X	POST-TEST	141

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The relative power positions of husbands and wives are vital elements of domestic groups and ones which have been examined with increasing frequency in studies of the family. Turk and Bell (1972) point out that, the research on power relations of families has been abundant in the last few decades. The analysis of antecedents and consequences of power has gradually become one of the major areas of inquiry. In fact, research in this area has become so large, that the area was considered to be one of the major areas of research in the sixties (Burr, 1973). Oppong (1970) note that, in the past few years, several studies have had as their central focus, the exploration of relative power of family members. The problems of who makes the final decisions in what areas, who has the largest share in the process (in terms of who makes most of the decisions, who contributes more ideas, the kind of decisions made); who actually initiates the problem and who wins over have been investigated to a great extent in order to find out the power structure of families.

A. THE PROBLEM

Inspite of being the favorite subject for research, past research in family power is inconclusive. Safilios-Rothschild (1970) remarks that despite the availability of studies one would have an impossible task should one want to describe the power structure of North American families.

Several scholars have indicated that the equalitarian family as a norm is a myth. Students of family power are plagued with both the feminist outcry and scholarly confusion while describing the power structure of a family. Power is still a stock concept in the social scientists bag of tools. There are an increasing number of cautions placed on the use of research results. It is apparent from a review of the literature that it is impossible to have a clear picture of marital power until the methodology of power structure studies improves considerably by including a detailed study of each aspect of power and from the point of view of both the husband and wife. The consensus is that the concept needs to be re-examined.

B. THE NEED FOR THE STUDY

Criticisms of family power studies indicate a great need for conceptual clarifications. The challenges that resource theory faces can be alleviated only if it is re-examined with conceptual as well as methodological improvements, such as, the need for including both husbands and wives, and use of survey as well as observational techniques.

C. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The basic purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of the components of marital power and to clarify some of the issues raised by research scholars through conceptual and methodological improvements on past research. The present study therefore intends to:

(1) Study only one dimension of marital power, decision making power, in the financial area. This is hoped to clarify conceptual confusions.

(2) Restrict the study to an understanding of marital decision making and to obtain the data from both husbands and wives in recognition of the fact that it is the perceptions of both husbands and wives that would best reveal the comprehensive nature of marital power.

(3) Apply both survey and observational techniques because it is strongly felt that a judicious combination of both survey and observational techniques is essential to assess marital power.

(4) Re-examine resource theory as it relates to marital power i.e. to see the relationship between the comparative resources (educational status, income and occupational

status) of a husband and his wife and the power enjoyed by them in marital relations.

(5) Adopt the same instruments used by Blood and Wolfe (1960) in order to make the comparison of data possible.

D. THE BASIC QUESTIONS

The basic questions that the study intends to answer are:

(1) Will the spouse who has greater education, occupational status and income enjoy more power in decision making?

(2) Does the frequency of organizational participation enhance the husband's power in marital decision making?

(3) Do older husbands enjoy more power in decision making than younger husbands?

(4) Do husbands enjoy more power than their wives in making decisions?

(5) Do the husband and wife in a marital relationship perceive power relations differently?

(6) Is there any relationship between the perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral power scores of either husbands or wives?

In order to obtain answers for these questions intact middle income families of a large Canadian city will be selected at random.

E. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The investigator will have to comply with certain limitations in carrying out this research. These can be listed as follows:

(1) A sample of only 50 couples will be included in the study.

(2) A simple game will be used because the investigator is mainly interested in studying the power relations of husbands and wives rather than developing a sophisticated observational tool which by itself will be a research project.

(3) Only 10 families will be requested to respond to a hypothetical decision situation, due to lack of time.

But for these limitations, it is felt that this study by itself will be a massive research project and is more sophisticated than previous studies both as regards to its conception of marital power and the manner in which it attempts to measure marital decision making power.

F. PLAN OF THE THESIS

The study will be reported in the following manner:

(1) Review of relevant literature on family power.

(2) Critical examination of conceptual and methodological issues.

(3) Selection of a theoretical basis for the study of

marital power.

(4) Design of the research to collect the data.

(5) Analysis of data and interpretation of results.

(6) Summary and implications for future research in the area of marital power.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON FAMILY POWER

In reviewing the literature related to family power structure, one is struck by the abundance of research studies during the past decade and a half in the United States and other countries. An intensive review of articles concerned with the power issue, indicates that, interest in this area continues.

The major studies published are those by Blood (1963, 1967); Blood and Wolfe (1960); those by Kenkel (1961, 1963) and those by Wilkening and Bharadwaj (1967, 1968), Wilkening and Lupri (1965), and Wilkening and Morrison (1963). In addition, a variety of studies have been made ascertaining the decision making patterns in different types of American families (Burchinal and Bauder, 196[illegible] Heer, 1962; Hill, 1965; King, 1969; Olson, 1969; Rollins, 1963; Schlesinger, 1962; and Smith, 1967). There have also been studies recording students projections of decision making in families (Lovejoy, 1961), decision making differences by race and class (Middleton and Putney, 1960) and the relationship between decision making and religion (Larson and Johannis, 1967). A number of other studies report general research in the area of family power (Bahr and

Rollins, 1971; Edwards, 1969; Evans and Smith, 1969 and Gillespie, 1971). The remainder of studies deal with cross-cultural examinations of family power (Lamous, 1969; Lupri, 1969; Rodman, 1967; Safilios-Rothschild, 1967 and others).

A. THE NATURE OF POWER

One of the most important aspects of family structure is the power positions of family members (Blood and Wolfe, 1960). Marital power has been the target of interest in many studies because it is one of the central concepts for describing the behavior of marital pairs (Oppong, 1970). As Komarovsky (1967) and Sprey (1972) maintain, an analysis of marital power points to crucial dimensions of marital life. One could explain some family behavior through the relative power relations of family members. Blood and Wolfe (1960) demonstrate that the balance of power between a husband and wife is a sensitive reflection of the roles they play in marriage and in turn, has many repercussions on other aspects of their relationship. Marital power refers to the dynamics of married living and specifically how husbands and wives interact and deal with each other in making decisions. Since husbands and wives are indeed dependent on each other for vital expressive and socio-economic benefits, they do in fact have a certain amount of power over each other.

Family power is a multidimensional concept that is measured indirectly through behavioral acts in which the degree of one's power is put to test. Safilios-Rothschild (1970) says that the configuration of decision making patterns, tension and conflict management and the type of prevailing division of labor tends to reflect the prevailing model of power.

The power position of a husband or wife fluctuates with changes in interaction and spouses appear to adjust their behavior in an effort to obtain better outcomes. The working out of a satisfying power relationship is very important to successful progress through stages in the family life cycle. According to Safilios-Rothschild (1972), one family member may control the other's behavior because he disposes off important rewards, he can mete out punishments, he is perceived as having the right to power, he is considered desirable for other members to identify with, or he is thought to possess superior knowledge and skills (Komarovsky, 1967).

B. POWER DEFINED:

Power has been variously defined in previous research. One definition of power is that it is the probability that a member within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will, despite resistance or opposition (Phillips, 1967; Weber, 1947). Towney (1931) remarks that power may also be defined as the capacity of an individual to modify the conduct of other individuals. Buckley (1967) defines power as the capacity of an individual to control the behavior of others either directly by feat, or indirectly by the manipulation of available means. Blau (1964) says that, "Broadly speaking power refers to all kinds of influence between persons or groups where one induces others according to his wishes."

According to Blood and Wolfe (1960) power is manifested in the ability to make decisions affecting the life of the family. Straus (1964) defines power as "actions which control, initiate, change or modify the behavior of another member of the family. Mishler and Waxler (1968) define power as the ability to influence or control others behavior. Wladis-Hoffman (1960) views power simply as the extent to which one decides over the other partner. Scanzoni (1970) describes power as the ability of a person to impose his will on others. Bahr and Rollins (1971), Safilios-Rothschild (1967) and others define power as the ability of one person to control another. It is important to see the equivalance of these definitions. It would appear from these definitions that the common element in definitions of marital power is the ability of a spouse to influence the behavior of the other through the decision making process. Power in other words is control or influence over the actions of others to promote one's goals without their "consent", against their "will" or without their "knowledge" or "understanding". This does not mean that power would always be held by one partner alone, or that one partner would have more power than the other, or that the criterion of power can not shift situationally. There can be the so-called equalitarian family, where power is held by both partners equally and one partner can equally influence the other.

C. TYPES OF POWER

Safilios-Rothschild (1972) maintains that family power is a multi-dimensional, comprehensive typology and would include different types and different levels of power. The major types of power according to her are: Legitimate Power, Decision Making Power, Influence, Resource Power, Expert Power, Affective Power, Dominance Power, Tension Management Power, and Moral Power. Of these existing types of power, decision making power has been most commonly studied by research scholars because of its relevance and importance.

D. OPERATIONALIZING POWER

It is apparent that decision making power is one of the major dimensions of family power. Family power is measured indirectly through behavior in which an individual's power is put to test. Sprey (1972) and Safilios-Rothschild (1970) are of the same opinion in saying that a closer investigation of the decision process may teach about other crucial dimensions of power. Blood and Wolfe (1960) suggest that in order to measure the precise balance of power between the husband and wife, one has to assess their power in all family decisions. Researchers have investigated not only who makes the decision, but also who exerts influence in the decision making process.

The exhange theory of Scanzoni (1970) and the resource theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960) suggest that the family reveals its power structure through the decision making process. In other words power is operationalized through the decision making process. Family power is revealed through the decision making process. It is evident that with the evolution of equalitarian families, there are more people who opt for joint decisions (Phelan and Ruef, 1961). This would indicate that there is a close relationship between family power and decision making. However, one has to be careful because decision making will not or cannot describe all the dimensions of family power structure.

Families make decisions regarding all aspects of family life. It could be argued that most of these decisions have financial implications. As Safilios-Rothschild (1971) puts it, financial resources are necessary for the sustenance and welfare of the family. It has been shown in several research studies that the person who makes major financial decisions is the one enjoying more power in family decision making. Since the breadwinner is the source of finances, he can be assumed to have most of the power while making financial decisions. So long as rationing by the purse governs the distribution of power, it becomes inevitable to correlate financial decisions with power. Certainly control over financial decision making has major importance for family patterns since a whole family life style can be changed with one major financial decision (Honey, et. al., 1959). Ferber (1971) argues that almost all decision making is financial, which lends support to the research tradition of concentration in the financial decision making realm. Because of the effect of financial decisions on family one can justify the use of financial decisions to study family power.

E. POWER STRUCTURE OF FAMILIES

Family theorists like Bertrand (1958), Bowerman and Elder (1964), Kandel and Lasser (1972), Lupri (1969), Mogey (1957), Nelson (1955), Nimkoff (1965), Ogburn and Nimkoff (1955), Taylor (1949), Vogel (1965) and others consider that modern marriages have evolved from the possession of power by the adult male, to a much more democratic form. There are other studies by Buric and Zecevic (1967) Dyer and Urban (1958), Gillespie (1971), Komarovsky (1967), Rodman (1967) and Safilios-Rothschild (1967), which show that this may not be true. As Gillespie (1971) comments "equalitarian marriage as a norm is a myth. Equal power we do not have; equal power we will never get, so long as the present socio-economic status remains." He proceeds to say that in competition with his wife, a man has most of the advantages.

Other authors like Rodman (1967), Buric and Zecevic (1967) and Safilios-Rothschild (1967) show that the distribution of power varies with the decision to be made from one culture to another and within all cultures. It is apparent from these, that though there has been considerable study of marital power, a student of the family would find it hard to understand and explain family power.

The most common typology of family power structure employs the categories of father dominant, mother dominant, equalitarian-syncratic and equalitarian-autonomic (Herbst, 1954; Wolfe, 1964). Syncratic power involves sharing equally, all decisions. Whereas autonomic power is characterized by an equal division of decision making responsibility.

F. THEORIES OF FAMILY POWER

Of the several theories of marital power three standout as being important: Blood and Wolfe's (1960) theory of resources in marital decision making; exchange theory of Scanzoni (1970) and the role theory of Parsons and his followers (1964).

1. Resource Theory:

Resource Theory assumes that the relative power of husbands and wives in making family decisions depends upon the resources which each spouse brings into the marriage. A resource has been defined as anything that one partner may make available to the other, helping the latter to satisfy the needs or attain the goals. "The balance of power will be on the side of that partner who contributes the greater resources to the marriage." As one partner is able to contribute more than his share to the marriage, he possesses the basis for a more than fifty-fifty say in decisions. According to these authors, an automatic readjustment occurs as the contributing partner discovers that he has a lot to offer to the marriage, while the receiving partner feels indebted for what has already been given and dependent upon what he hopes to receive in the future. The partner who may provide or withhold resources is in a strategic position for influencing their disposition. Hence, power accrues spontaneously to the partner who has the majority of resources at his disposal. According to resource theory, culture is not a sufficient explanation for power. It accrues support from studies which show that husband's power increases with education, income earned and social status.

2. Exchange Theory

Scanzoni (1970) uses exchange theory to explain family power. The more the husband fulfills his economic duties and thus, the more the wife defines her status rights as being met, the more she will allow her husband to define the norms for her duties and his rights. She will accede his rights and her duties in terms of household decision making. Thereby, she, in essence, gives him power to shape the full dimension of the conjugal unit in exchange for the economic rewards and status benefits he provides her vis-a-vis the larger community. She is more motivated to "go along" with him. to "give in" to him, to "let him have his way", to the extent that he provides maximum economic rewards. But to the degree that those rewards fail to meet her expectations, she is less motivated to acceed to him. According to exchange theory what is exchanged in husband-wife interaction and familial decision making is the satisfaction of an obligation, for which another is incurred. Also, as Edwards (1969) and Murstein (1971) put it, no family member incurs cost without the expectation that there will be compensation for it. The exchange processes appear to serve as mechanisms for regulating family interaction, thus fostering the development of a network of family relations and a rudimentary of family structure (Gouldner, 1960).

3. Role Theory

Another theory of family power that has been developed by Parsons (1964) and his followers is the role theory. According to Parsons (1964), husbands play the instrumental roles of giving suggestions, while wives tend to play the expressive roles of maintaining harmony in the family. Parsons and Bales (1955) contend that the position of father in a family usually leads to superior power or authority of the occupant in the instrumental areas. Modern family theorists criticize this theory, because, expressive and instrumental components are evident in every individual regardless of sex.

All of these theoretical frameworks appear to have some limitations. Safilios-Rothschild (1970) comments that in practically all cases only decision making is measured by family sociologists, when formulating theories to explain familial power structure. She raises the question that "when we do not know who has the authority to make decisions, or who can influence the direction in which decisions are made of what value are theories which explain only who makes most of the decisions?" She believes that no systematic theory can be developed until all dimensions of power have been thoroughly and cross-culturally investigated and their inter-relations understood.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES: CRITICAL REVIEW

It is important, to point out that the majority of articles on family power appearing in journals have been commentaries on methodological issues which have plagued the scientific study of family power (Bahr, 1971; Grandbois and Willett, 1970; Hess and Torney, 1963; Kandel and Lasser, 1972; Kenkel, 1963; Liu et. al. 1973; Lively, 1969; Olson, 1969; Olson and Rabunsky, 1972; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Sprey, 1971; Turk and Bell, 1972 and Van Es and Shingi, 1972). Questions concerning the measurement of power within families have been the subject of several doctoral dissertations (Cromwell, 1972; Olson, 1967; Turk, 1970). Although they have been of some help in stimulating thinking in the minds of research scholars, they failed to show the necessary solutions to these problems. Olson and Rabunsky (1972) point out that past measures of family power have been plagued with serious conceptual and methodological problems.

A. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Heer (1963) and Oppong (1970) note that several studies which have had as their central focus, the exploration of the relative power and authority of family members, have been concerned merely with the decision making power of husbands and wives. Safilios-Rothschild (1970) elaborates on this, by commenting that, most investigators in this area have used interchangeably the terms "family power", "marital power", or "power structure" and terms "decision making", "family authority" and "influence". Some investigators have defined one of these terms in a way that another term has been defined by another author. For example, Buric and Zecevic (1967) and Hill (1965) equate decision making with marital authority patterns, while Fitzimmons and Perkins (1947) use the word "responsibility" to refer to family power. Heer (1958) uses "dominance", "influence" and "power to make decisions" as exchangeable terms. Hill (1965) utilizes the operational notion of decision making as an indication of "authority", "responsibility" and "division of labor" in families. Sharrock (1951) makes use of the term "authority", "power" and "decision making" to mean the same. Others, while only measuring decision making, used the terms "decision making power" or "power structure", "decision authority", "authority", "control", or "influence", practically interchangeably without making any distinction between them (Lamous, 1969; Lupri, 1969; Michel, 1967; and Safilios-Rothschild, 1967).

Olson and Rabunsky (1972) point out, that researchers have generally failed to distinguish between different measures of power from such related variables as "authority" and "decision making". Safilios-Rothschild (1970) and Olson and Rabunsky (1972) criticize that no distinction has been made between the terms "decision making", "authority", "power" and "influence". Previous research seems to have ignored the fact that the concept of family power is a multi-dimensional one, containing among other things, the dimensions of decision making, influence and authority. Even if conceptual distinctions have been made in the beginning, empirical data has been used to explain one final phenomena that is family power. With very few exceptions, as Safilios-Rothschild (1970) shows, only decision making has been studied and the results discussed as if referring to the whole dimension of family power and authority.

B. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The methodological problems encountered in previous research can be listed as: dependency on one family member's responses, reliance on either survey or observational techniques, calculation of overall decision making score and problems of comparability of data.

1. Dependency on One Family Member's Responses

It is evident that, for the most part, studies have utilized survey techniques using only the wife as respondent, despite the fact that considerable discrepancies have been found between the husband's and wife's responses when both were interviewed, (Burchinal and Vauder, 1965; Granbois and Willett, 1970; Heer, 1962; Larson, 1972; Olson and Rabunsky, 1972; Safilios-Rothschild, 1969; Scanzoni, 1965; Turk and Bell, 1972 and Wilkening and Morrison, 1963). These discrepancies ranged from 15-30 per cent in Heer's study (1962), in which a single over-simplified and general question was asked about decision making; to 23-64 percent for the different decisions included in the study of Wilkening and Morrison (1963); to 55.1 to 76.4 percent of all cases depending on the extent of disagreement, in Safilios-Rothschild's study (1969). This indicates that, by relying on one set of answers, one cannot describe the entire picture of familial power structure. The obtained results reflect only how that particular family member perceives it. For this reason Safilios-Rothschild (1969) rightly refers to family sociology as "wife's family sociology". Turk and Bell (1972) comment that the findings depend on which family member is treated as the key respondent. Larson (1972) comments that, to ignore differential perception of family structure and process seems to create a sterile and over-simplified view of family phenomena. He further criticizes that, the nature of family reality may be inaccurately represented by selecting individual family respondents as the family spokesman because both the attitudes and perceptions differ.

There are a few studies which obtained data from both husbands and wives, but for various reasons used only one spouse's answers in the analysis (Heer, 1962; Scanzoni, 1965; and Wilkening and Morrison, 1963). They could not use the responses of both husbands and wives effectively to explain family phenomena. As Safilios-Rothschild (1970) puts it, "while the discrepancies between the husband's and wife's perceptions of decision making could give a good insight into family dynamics and probably could be explainable by means of the prevailing authority and influence patterns, most investigators have either ignored them or considered them as by-products of faulty methodology (Scanzoni, 1965; Wilkening and Morrison, 1963) or used only the husband's answers because they were considered to be the most accurate answers (Heer, 1962).

Another more apparent weakness in family research is the reliance on the responses of student. Findings are often based on college students samples. The justifications for these selected views of family power are typically, cost, accessibility, or the assumption of basic agreement among family members. While there is certainly support for the first two agruements there is little evidence to support the assumption of interpersonal family agreement.

In some studies only the children were interviewed to find the power relations of families (Bowerman and Elder, 1964; Hess and Torney, 1962; King, 1969; Rollins, 1963; Towzard, 1967; and Wladis-Hoffman, 1960). This was done mainly out of convenience to the researcher. When children are used as informants of family power, it has been shown that their responses vary systematically with sex and age (Hess and Torney, 1962). Turk and Bell (1972) and Larson (1972) effectively illustrate the discrepant responses between adult and child family members in the assessment of family power. Therefore, relying on children's answers for the description of familial power structure is a misleading procedure in exactly the same way as relying on any one source of information relative to family power (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). Furthermore, Hess and Torney (1962), King (1969) and Larson (1972) showed that the age and sex of the child influence their perceptions of family power structure.

2. Exclusive Reliance on Survey Techniques

The self-report technique requires that respondents be able to describe who exercises power in making decisions; but people are not accustomed to conceptualize their interactions in these terms. Wilkening and Morrison (1963) suggest that survey techniques have obvious limitations for studying the influence and interaction of two or more people. What the person reports is influenced by the scope of what he observes, cultural norms with respect to the roles of interacting persons and personal biases relating to the interaction. Olson and Rabunsky (1972) point out that there are certain limitations of the self report or survey method. They can be listed as:

(a) difficulties involved in recalling past experiences due to forgetfulness,

(b) the nature of family power which makes it hard to indicate who made the decision and to realize who actually influenced the decision process,

(c) perceptual biases through which respondents tend to give socially desirable responses and to under or over estimate their own power (Feldman, 1967; Heer, 1962; Turk and Bell, 1972) and

(d) the social, familial and individualistic norms which seem to influence the respondents while describing the power structure of families.

The so-called observational technique has been employed by some family researchers (Kenkel, 1963; Straus and Tallman, 1966; and Bahr, 1969) when studying family power. It has been used to observe the process of decision making, or to find out the influence techniques used by one partner over the other while making a decision or performing a task. So far observation techniques have been used to observe actual decision making processes at home or to plot the decision making process under simulated situations or just to observe couples while performing a task. Observational techniques are assumed to measure all dimensions of power with a high degree of validity and reliability. While observational techniques could be most appropriately used to measure the process of decision making, only some aspects of power can be studied in a restricted manner by these. For example, most observational techniques can study only the decision making process in a small number of decisions, sometimes actual family decisions (Kenkel, 1963), sometimes "simulated decisions" about relatively unimportant issues, as with SIMFAM (Straus and Tallman, 1966; Bahr, 1969). The major controversy raised regarding the use of observational techniques in studying family decision revolves around the fact that persons tend to behave according to socially desired norms under observation conditions (Karlsson, 1964; and Olson, 1969). Even the dominant spouse may accept losing during a public exhibition of power in order not to humiliate the partner. It seems to be better not to inform a couple that they are being observed for their power relations.

As has been indicated by Safilios-Rothschild (1969), some decisions cannot be observed because of their intimate nature, others because the time required for the process of decision making, and still others because the techniques require the performance of some special task. Above all observational studies require more human as well as non-human resources. In addition, the elaborate setting used in the laboratory situation seems to distort the spousal interaction while making family decisions as compared to home (O'Rourke, 1963). Also it is difficult to isolate one behavior from the complexities of human interaction. A further criticism is that previous researchers have studied only one decision or studied a decision that has no relevance to the family and generalized their observations to all family decisions (Safilior-Rothschild, 1970). While a variety of "semi-observational" techniques have been used in which family members are asked to come to joint decisions whenever their individual decisions differ (Farina and Dunham, 1963; Ferriera and Winter, 1965; Strodtbeck, 1951), only in one set of studies (Olson, 1969) was the importance and relevance of the included decisions tested and reported by the respondents themselves to be high. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether it is possible to assess the "typical influence techniques" used in actual decision making process in an observational technique. Besides this, it seems very hard to select a particular decision that is relevant to all families (Farina and Dunham, 1963; Ferriera and Winter, 1965; Olson, 1969) because all decisions have something to do with family values. This suggests that it may be better to study the family while they are responding to a simple situation rather than making a particular decision. This is not to say that one is better off if he simulates a situation and observes, because simulation techniques are rather complicated, but they appear to eliminate some of the problems discussed above.

Olson and Rabunsky (1972) and others found that there is a lack of correspondence between the observational and self report techniques which shows yet another methodological problem. Heer's (1963) review of the literature on the measurement of family power provides a valuable critique of the diverse methods which have been employed. Heer (1963) notes that the crucial problem common to observational or self report techniques is that any one of these measures have difficulty measuring all dimensions of power. Family power is a multi-dimensional concept. Persons having power in one area of family decision making do not necessarily have the same degree of power in other areas.

As Scanzoni (1970) declares much more research is needed to determine the relative validity of each as well as those situations in which perhaps one or more of the approaches might be more appropriate. No research has so far been conducted to determine whether a method that taps one specific area of decision making, is also tapping the areas of conflict for any given family, (Scanzoni, 1970).

3. Calculation of Overall Decision Making Score

Another methodological short-coming which has been brought forth by Safilios-Rothschild (1970) and Kandel and Lasser (1972) is the calculation of an over-all decision making score giving equal weight to each decision and neglecting the importance of the decision to each respondent and its frequency in each family. The calculation and use of an overall decision making score is meaningless because in reality we know that some decisions are important; some need more time and energy to arrive at; some are made frequently, and some occasionally. Safilios-Rothschild (1970) maintains, that, differentiation of decisions according to the above two criteria and the calculation of four different scores or a score weighted according to frequency and importance might greatly refine the measurement of decision making patterns. In addition, the evaluation of the degree of importance attached to decisions and the degree of frequency with which they are made should be made by the respondents themselves, rather than on the basis of the expert knowledge of the researcher. No research has been carried out to find whether it is justifiable to give equal weight to each of the decision making areas. Some areas may be extremely vital to the power process while others are irrelevant. Heer (1965) and others have used an alternative to assigning weights to specified areas of decision making which is known as the generalized question approach. In this approach the respondent was asked to report "who wins out", "get his/her way", "usually decides", when an important or major or frequent disagreement arises. Heer (1965) acknowledges the major failure of this method to be its inability to obtain a precise measure of family power based on an over-all view of the process of decision making. One does however, obtain an impression of where power lies.

4. Problems of Comparability of Data

In reported studies of family decision making the decisions included varied considerably from study to study. For example in some American studies decisions such as those related to family size, child rearing, relationships with in-laws, purchase of furniture, clothes and household equipment, choice of friends and the use of leisure time are omitted (Blood and Wolfe , 1960). In other studies such as those conducted by Wilkening and Bharadwaj (1967), decisions concerning the purchase of major household equipment, the invitation of people to dinner and three specific decisions about child rearing were asked, but decisions covering family size, relationship with in-laws, medical consultation or purchase of insurance were excluded. In Burchinal and Bauder's (1965) Iowa Study, 21 specific decisions were included covering most family decisions left out in other studies except for decisions relating to the type of medical consultation and the type of house or apartment to take. On the other hand Michel (1967) included in her French study a decision concerning choice of common reading matter as an important decision while without any reported rationale she omitted decisions relating to relationships with in-laws, family size or use of leisure time.

The extent to which specific decisions were studied also varied considerably from one study to another (some dealt with a detailed investigation while others asked only general questions). Thus, some investigators ask, "who has the final say about how the available money will be used?" (Safilios-Rothschild, 1967) and others break it down to specific questions such as: "who usually makes the final decision about how much money your family can afford to spend per week on food?" (Blood and Wolfe, 1960) or even more specific questions such as "how much to spend on food" (Burchinal and Bauder, 1965).

The extent to which each investigator chose husband dominant, equalitarian, or wife dominated decisions varied, thus producing an entirely different picture with each study. These suggest that there is a great need to replicate studies in order to provide comparable data. The comparisons of findings whether intra or cross-cultural are neither meaningful nor valid. One combination of decisions may show that the Detroit family is, according to the wife's opinion, husband dominant (Blood and Wolfe, 1960) and another combination may show that it is autonomous (Safilios-Rothschild, 1969).

C. SUMMARY

Major defects of previous research may be summarized as follows

(1) Conceptual shortcomings involved in the studies of family power,

(2) Exclusive reliance on wives' answers,

(3) Exclusive reliance on survey methods,

(4) Methodological problems relating to observational techniques,

(5) Lack of correspondence between observational and survey techniques,

(6) Calculation of an over-all decision making score giving equal weight to each decision and neglecting the importance of a particular decision to each family,

(7) Incongruity between the decision used in different studies resulting in problems of comparability of data, and

(8) Omission of certain important aspects like cultural impact, understanding between husband and wife as to who should decide what in the family.

All these indicate that there is tremendous need for further studies of family power. Olson and Rabunsky (1972) recommends that further conceptual and methodological attention be given to the concept of family power before more substantive studies are done using this concept. He further proceeds to say that "if family investigators are truly interested in studying family process such as occurs in decision making and conflict resolution they need to utilize dynamic conceptual and methodological models that deal with the reciprocal nature of the family discussions and negotiations."

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

A. THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE STUDY OF MARITAL POWER

Resource Theory:

Of the available theories of family power, namely, the resource theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960), the exchange theory of Heer (1963) and Scanzoni (1970), the theory of resources in cultural context by Rodman (1967) and the role theory of Parsons (1955); the resource theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960) is considered to be the most appropriate to base this study on. According to this theory, the sources of power in so intimate a relationship as marriage are sought in the comparative resources which the husband and wife bring to marriage. Each partner is assumed to recognize the resources the other possesses and to defer to superior knowledge and skills. The balance of power according to resource theory is determined by the comparative resources of the two partners. As Blood and Wolfe (1960) put it, the husband is not able to exercise power just because he is "the man of the house". Rather, he must prove his right to power or win power by virtue of his own skills and accomplishments in competition with his wife. A very important point raised in this theory is that the balance of power is after all, an interpersonal affair and the wife's own characteristics can not long be disrespected if we are to understand who makes the decisions. It is, therefore desirable to compare the wife and the husband on the same characteristics for their comparative resourcefulness and competence.

In summary, the power to make decisions stems primarily from the resources which the individual can provide to meet the needs of the partner and to upgrade his own decision making skills. The present research adopts this theory because it is felt that the balance of power is adapted to the interpersonal relationship of the two partners involved in a marriage. In essence it is realized that power is a matter of mutual recognition of individual skills in particular areas of competence. It is also felt that in North American society where equalitarianism is a norm the balance of power in a marriage is based on comparative resources of partners rather than on tradition.

Resource theory has faced the criticisms of several family sociologists. Heer (1963) points out that while Blood and Wolfe (1960) actually measured only one aspect of family power (household decision making), they nonetheless imply that this is all there is to power within the conjugal family. Subsequent research using a different selection of decisions, however, show completely different decision making trends than those found by Blood and Wolfe (1960). Safilios-Rothschild (1967) Buric and Zecevic (1967) and Feldman (1967) indicate that in Greece, Yugoslavia and Ghana there is a significant negative correlation between some of the resources brought by the individual and the power enjoyed by him. Besides this the one sided data obtained only on the wives' responses limit the validity and adequacy of this theory. No research has been conducted to determine whether it is justified to give equal weight to each of the decision making areas.

Heer (1963) has proposed a revision of resource theory. It does not alter the form of what has already been stated but restricts it in scope, to economic resources. It is contingent upon the assertion that each partner conceives the possibility of separation, divorce and subsequent remarriage. His emphasis on economic resources alone is too narrow. Heer's theory can only be indirectly applied to the comparative education of partners (Blood, 1963). This theory may be relevant for couples who aspire for, or who actually experience rapid upward mobility, but less pertinent for couples who are socially stable (Scanzoni, 1970). Therefore it has not been considered by many in studying family power.

Rodman (1967) has proposed another theory, placing emphasis on culture. His theory of resources in cultural context explains why there are differences between the power relations of husbands and wives in different cultures. Since the major aim of this study is to see how the possession of resources influence the power positions of marital pairs this modification is not being considered as suitable for this study.

of the several forms of the resource theory, Blood and Wolfe's (1960) original conception of the theory appears to be the most capable of explaining marital decision power. Being cognizant of the weaknesses as well as strengths of this theory, this theory is being taken as the basis for this study.

B. METHODOLOGY

The nature of information needed has helped the investigator to decide on the extent to which control over the research setting is necessary. In this study, husbands and wives are interviewed, separately and simultaneously, in two different rooms of their home, to learn about their perceptions of, and attitudes to power relations. A subsample which agreed to play a decision making game is used to record power relations in a decision making situation. The process of obtaining the data and the controls imposed will be discussed in the following pages.

1. Hypotheses

Resource Theory contends that there is a direct relationship between comparative educational status, and the amount of power the husband or wife has; the comparative occupational status and their voice in marital decisions and comparative incomes and spousal power in decision making. Marital power of a husband according to Blood and Wolfe (1960) is enhanced by the frequency with which he participates in community organizations. They also maintain that older couples tend to be more traditional than younger couples. Besides these, Olson and Rabunsky (1972) and Turk and Bell (1972) observe that there are discrepancies between a husband's and his wife's responses and between perceptual and behavioral power. The hypotheses of this study are derived from these studies. The major hypotheses considered in this study are:

(a) The higher the educational status of one spouse, compared to the other, the greater that persons power in making family decisions.

(b) The higher the occupational status of one spouse, compared to the other, the greater the power of that person in decision making.

(c) The higher the income earned by one spouse, compared to the other, the greater that persons power in making decisions.

(d) The greater the frequency with which a husband participates in community organizations, the greater his power in decision making.

(e) The older a husband is, the more traditional he is in making decisions.

(f) Husbands enjoy more power than their wives in marital decision making.

(g) A husband's perceptions of power bears no relationship to his wife's perception of marital power.

(h) Neither a husband's or a wife's attitudes to decision power, nor their perceptions of power in decision making bears any relationship to their decision making behavior.

2. Definitions of Terms

The basic variables that are being studied in arriving at an understanding of power structure of families as indicated in the hypotheses, are the attitudinal, perceptual and behavioral variables of power. The following section classifies the variables used in this research.

(a) Power

This study utilizes the definition that has been used indirectly in the literature. Marital power is defined here as the capacity of a partner to influence the decision making process and to make the final decisions that are relevant and important to family life. This definition is preferred because power is operationalized in the process of decision making. The perceived, attitudinal and behavioral measures are taken as different methods of measuring marital power.

(b) Attitudes

Attitudes have been variously defined. Secord and Backman's (1964) definition seems to fit the needs of the present research and therefore the definition given by them is adopted in this study. According to them, the term "attitude" refers to certain regularities in an individual's feelings, thoughts and predispositions to act toward some aspect of his environment. The present study aims at obtaining the attitudes of husbands' and wives' to decision making.

(c) Perception

Safilios-Rothschild (1970) asserts that the familial power structure as perceived by the wife, and by the husband are probably very significant variables. Since it is each person's perceived reality that affects the behavior, the style and quality of interpersonal relationships, perception here is defined as "the selection, organization, and interpretation, by an individual, of specific stimuli, according to prior learning, activities, interests, experiences, etc." (Theoderson and Theoderson, 1969). Perceived power would be in the nature of self report data, and poses the question of who usually makes a particular decision in the family.

(d) Behavior

Another conceptual variable considered is that of behavior. The introduction of this variable is an implicit recognition that there may be a difference between subjective reality as measured by attitudes and objective reality as measured by behavior. There is thus an attempt to measure what the husband and wife are observed to do and what they report doing. Acceptance of both techniques as measuring some dimension of family power structure becomes essential in view of the reported criticisms of previous studies. In this context then, behavior is defined as "the observable or the actual response of an individual to a specific decision making process (a particular situation)".

Behavioral power is operationalized as influence. Safilios-Rothschild (1972) defines "influence as the degree to which formal or informal, overt or covert pressure of some kind is successfully exerted by the one spouse on the other, so that his /her point of view is imposed about a pending decision despite initial opposition on the part of the other spouse." Thus, the spouse who, makes most of the decisions and gets most of the wishes reflected in the final decision is considered as having more power than the partner. It should be possible to obtain "power perceptions" of the husbands and wives through self report data by asking the question, "Who usually makes a particular decision?" and "behavioral power" through observation of husband-wife interaction in a decision making situation.

If one sees decision making as the measure of family power, (because power is operationalized in the process of decision making and is a factor which influences decision making), and if the reported perception of power and the observed behavior in a decision making situation are analyzed carefully, then one should be able to map the power structure of a given family.

3. The Sample

A cursory examination of various samples utilized in the study of family power demonstrates an extremely wide range of variation. Perhaps the most notable trend is toward the use of smaller samples. As Nye (1964) comments, the increase in studies with samples of 100 or less coincides very closely with the proposition and carrying out of studies employing an interview as the technique for gathering data.

Keeping this issue in mind, the investigator decided upon a sample of 50 couples. Four controls were placed on the selection of the couples:

(a) all couples were currently married

(b) total family income was categorized as middle income ranging from 6,000-21,000 dollars

(c) couples had been married at least 5 years and not more than 10 years, and

(d) couples did not have any children in the adolescent age group.

These controls were selected because the investigator was mainly interested in intact families in order to interview and use the responses of husbands and wives . Middle income families were chosen for this study because the 1971 census data show that the mean income of Canadian families was $10,300. On the basis of this, the families whose income varied from $6,000 to $21,000 were included in the study. The length of marriage was limited to 5-10 years with the idea that couples married this long would have established patterns of decision making and would have a relatively clear picture of their power relations. Families with no adolescent children were selected because of research (King, 1969; Larson, 1972), which indicated that adolescent children influence family decisions to a great extent. The decision to restrict the study to only 50 families was reached, because of the exploratory nature of the research to determine theoretical generalizations rather than statistical generalizations.

A list of all non-academic staff of a large Canadian University was used to identify the sample. This population was selected because it represented a wide variety of occupational backgrounds, it was considered to include many married individuals in the middle income range and the group was accessible through campus mail. All the 1,525 married staff members were contacted by a letter (Appendix I) explaining the survey and requesting their co-operation. A preliminary survey form was enclosed requesting information related to marital status, length of marriage, number and ages of children and income (Appendix II). A reminder (Appendix III) was sent two weeks later, to all those who did not return the form.

Response to the preliminary survey was 69 per cent of the total sample (1,055). Of the 67 per cent usuable responses 162 families satisfied the requirements of intact, middle income families, married for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years, having no adolescent children. As a result of reactions to survey, a sample of 90 families was then selected at random by using a table of random numbers. This decision to draw more couples than the required number was reached because it was felt that the refusal rate would be high. A random sample of 20 families was/ then picked from the 90, for the game. All 90 families were contacted by phone to get their agreement to participate in the study and to establish a time for the interview.

Sixty-two of the 90 families contacted, agreed to participate in the study. Of these 62 families, 12 couples were unable to arrange an appointment and only 50 families were interviewed and 10 of the 50 played the game.

4. Instruments Used

The purposes and goals of this study were to suggest the use of two basic methodological approaches. Keeping Safilios-Rothschild's (1970) suggestions in mind both survey and experimental methods were employed. It was felt that the dimensions of attitudes toward power and perception of power could best be measured through the interview schedule and the behavioral power relations through the use of a game. The position taken in this study was that, despite some of the weaknesses that have already been pointed out, the self report approach could contribute significantly to an understanding of family power. At the same time, some of the glaring inadequacies of this method could be corrected by using both the survey and experimental types of research. It was hoped that a combination of these two methods of data collection would give a clearer picture of the reality of family power and would act as effective tools to test resource theory.

The two instruments used to study the power relations of spouses were the interview schedule and the game.

(a) Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was used because of the obvious advantages it has over the questionnaire. The interview schedule consisted of five major parts:

Part 1: Participation in community organizations
Part 2: Patterns of division of labor and decision making
Part 3: Satisfaction with work and marriage
Part 4: Attitudes to decision making
Part 5: Demographic information

As far as possible previously tested scales and instruments were used in each of these parts. The major instruments are described below:

1. Blood and Wolfe (1960) Task Participation Index and Role Specialization Index:

This consisted of 8 items. The 8 tasks included in this instrument were:

-who repairs things around the house?

-who mows the lawn?
-who keeps track of the money and bills?
-who does the grocery shopping?
-who shovels the side walks?
-who gets the breakfast ready on work days?
-who straightens up the living room when company is coming?
and
-who does the evening dishes?

Reliability and validity

Though the reliability of this tool was not reported, it was proved to be a valid instrument in that the findings of Silverman and Hill (1967) were consistent with the resource theory.

2. Blood and Hamblin's (1958) Decision Power Index:

This instrument consisted of 8 decisions to provide an estimate of the relative balance of power between husband and wife. The eight decisions were:
-what car to buy?
-whether or not to buy life insurance?
-what house or apartment to take?
-what job the spouse should take?
-whether or not the husband or wife should go to work or quit work?

-how much money the family can afford to spend per week on food?
-what doctor to have when some one is sick? and
-where to go on a vacation.

Reliability and validity

The reliability of this instrument had not been reported by Blood and Wolfe (1960). The instrument had been used in a number of studies and was found to differentiate between groups or to be correlated with other variables in a theoretically meaningful pattern. Blood and Takeshita (1964) showed that this instrument was valid in several circumstances in various cultural contexts.

3. Dunn's Authority Sub-Scale (1960)

This consisted of 11 statements concerning power in making decisions and the respondent was expected to indicate agreement or disagreement on a five point scale. The 11 situations included were:
-whether the husband should decide finally where to live?
-if the wife's opinion should carry as much weight as the husband's in money matters?
-whether the husband should be the boss of the house?
-whether the wife should be informed as well as the husband concerning the family financial status?

-whether the husband should decide all the money matters?

-if the husband and wife should have equal privileges in such things as going out at night?

-whether the husband and wife should have equal say in decisions affecting the family?

-if the wife should fit her life to her husband's?

-whether planning for spending should be a joint proposition between husband and wife?

-whether the parents should permit their children to share according to their abilities in making decisions?

-whether the husband should make most of the decisions concerning children?

Reliability and validity

The reliability of this test was found to be split-half r : .98 (N=50). The test scores were found to vary according to the residence, social class, sex and marital status of the subjects in a pattern logically consistent with the construct.

Thus, the interview schedule consisted of questions to obtain background information and specific questions to determine the spousal perceptions and attitudes toward power relations in their marriage. Wherever possible, a Likert scale was used to obtain answers from the respondents. The interview schedule was pretested to test ambiguity and appropriateness of the questions. The alterations made in the final interview schedule presented in Appendix IV include, the addition of more open ended questions which were felt to enable the interviewer to obtain more relevant information, and the inclusion of questions regarding child care and recreational areas which were given less importance by Blood and Wolfe (1960). Provision also was made for the non-response or non-applicability of responses in both the scales of Blood and Wolfe (1960).

(b) The Game

Ryder (1969) pointed out that careful attention paid to actual conversations between husbands and wives quickly reveal the arbitrary nature of power ranking.

This study adopted Kenkel's method to study the actual power relations of spouses (Appendix V). Kenkel (1957, 1963) employed an interpretation of power which he termed "influence", and he ascribed power to the person who was able to have his own wishes reflected in the decision of the group. His method of assessing power was to ask the couple to decide how they would spend $300 if it were given to them by their friends or relatives. He took as his indication, the ability to suggest what the group subsequently chose. Presumably what persons first suggest is what they want. Having an individual preference correspond to the family's choice indicates that the individual could get what he wants. Such is the conception of power used in this study.

Three major modifications were made to Kenkel's game after pretesting:

(1) The couples were told that both of them had won money in the sweepstakes of Lipton Soup Company and that the money belonged to both of them. This was to make the couple feel that they had equal opportunity of spending that money. This technique was used to avoid the difficulty experienced by Kenkel (1963) when the individual whose relative had bequeathed the money, felt he/she had exclusive control on it. The couples were not told immediately how much money they had won in the Sweepstakes. Instead an envelope with $300 in play money was handed to them. This was done on purpose to see who actually took the envelope and counted the money. This action was assumed to be an indication of power enjoyed.

(2) The second modification made in this research was that the game was played in the home of each participating couple, where they would feel comfortable. This decision was also based on the fact that a laboratory situation influences the decision process.

(3) The third alteration made in Kenkel's game was that couples were not observed while they were deciding on spending the money because of the fear that they would try to behave in a "socially acceptable" way in front of

strangers. Their interactions were recorded on audio tapes and the tapes were then analyzed using Bales Interaction Process Categories (1950) (Appendix VI). Though the non-verbal communication between the spouses was not observed the investigator was aware of the value of it in the decision making process.

5. Data Collection

The couples were interviewed at a time that was convenient for them. The husband and wife were interviewed separately and simultaneously by two interviewers. They were interviewed in two separate rooms (usually the living room and the kitchen) and were requested not to influence the spouse while responding. This suggestion was made because in the pretest couples shouted to one another from the other room. Male and female interviewers alternated interviewing husbands and wives from one interview to another. The reason for this decision was to nullify the effect of sex of the interviewer on the respondents (Kenkel, 1961). A total of five interviewers, one woman and four men completed all the interviews. The respondents were asked to check the appropriate responses for most of the questions. The interviewers probed and wrote down the answers for the open-ended questions. The interviewing took approximately one hour.

The game was administered to a randomly selected portion of the total sample. For those playing the game, a pre-test (Appendix VII) was administered to determine their expectations of the decision making outcome. The pretest was administered to each member of the couple separately soon after the interview schedule. After the pre-test was completed the couple came together and were presented with the description of the game (Appendix VIII). The envelope containing the monopoly money was placed within equal reach of both the spouses. The investigator observed the couple and noted who took the envelope and who counted the money. The couple was then given the rules (Appendix IX) to be followed while deciding to spend that money. These rules were created in order to see that the couples discussed new issues and started thinking from the first stage of the decision making process and would really get involved in the process. The investigator then asked the couples if it was agreeable to them if their interactions were recorded on a tape recorder. After switching the tape recorder on, the investigator left the couple alone to make their decisions returning after 30 minutes. A list of the final items on which they decided to spend their money was collected. The post-test (Appendix X) was administered at this time to examine who they felt actually enjoyed power in that decision making process.

6. Statistical Analysis of Data

All the data on the interview schedules, pre-test, post-test and tapes were coded and analysed using proportions, percentages and the Chi square analysis. Tests of independent non-parametric correlations were also run to assess the relationships in the cases of perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral powers of husbands and wives.

The power perception scores for husbands and wives were computed on the bases of weights given to each response category, for example: husband always =5 and wife always =1. A range of total scores from 8-24 for all eight questions was considered as egalitarion and scores ranging from 25-40 were considered as traditional because it indicated that husband decided more than the wife or that the husband always decided.

The scores for attitudes were calculated on the basis of equalitarian responses. For example, a husband or wife saying that it was important for the wife to know the financial situation of a family, got one point. Thus those who stood out as being equalitarian in their attitudes got a total maximum score of 11.

The behavioral power was measured on the basis of their interactions as coded and analyzed using Bales interaction process categories. The spouse who made most of the final decisions and who got most of the wishes reflected in the decision making process was considered as the one enjoying more power.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter describes the sample in detail and reports tests of the relevant hypotheses.

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF FAMILIES STUDIED

By the nature of the design, all 50 families interviewed were intact, middle income families, married between five and ten years, having no adolescent children. On an average, these families were married for seven and a half years. More specifically, the mean number of children per family was 1.2, with 26 percent with of the families having no children, 62 percent with one or two children and 12 percent with 3 or more children. The ages of the children ranged from a few months to 9 years with the mean age being 3 years. The total annual income of these families ranged from $7,000 to $21,000 with more than 60 percent of the sample earning between $10,000 and $15,000. The mean income of these families was $9,520 per annum.

More surprisingly, a high percentage (72 per cent) of the families in the study lived either on the outskirts of the city or in satellite towns of Sherwood Park and St. Albert. Of the 100 subjects interviewed 61 percent were born in Canada and the remainder (39 per cent) came from other countries, having landed in Canada anywhere from one to 54 years ago. Sixty-two percent of these immigrants were recent immigrants having lived in Canada for not more than eight years.

As might be expected, a large number of persons participating in the study were young. The age of husbands in the study ranged from 24 to 55 years with mean being 32.5 years and that of the wives ranged from 23 to 48 years with the mean being 29.5 years. Ninety-four per cent of the husbands compared to 78 percent of the wives were gainfully employed at the time of the interview. Six per cent of the husbands were working on their higher education compared to only two per cent of the wives. The rest of the 20 per cent of the wives in the study were staying at home either because they had young children or because they were no longer receiving enough satisfaction from outside employment. All the husbands and 98 per cent of the wives had worked after their marriage. On an average the husbands had worked for about 6.8 years after marriage and the wives for 5.8 years. The number of hours spent in gainful employment per week ranged from 10 to 75 hours for husbands and 8 to 40 hours for wives. On an average the husbands spent about 40 hours per week in gainful employment and the wives spent only 34 hours.

B. TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

In order to test the relationships between the variables, the values of proportions, percentages, Spearman's Rank Order Correlation and Chi Square were obtained for the data collected. A significance level of 0.05 was established as the critical value for accepting the hypothesis. The levels of significance obtained for tests of the hypothesis are discussed throughout this chapter.

HYPOTHESIS - 1

The higher the educational status of one spouse compared to that of the other, the greater that person's power in making decision.

Results:

The educational status was measured in terms of the level of education completed in school and/or the number of years of university education. The range of educational levels for the husbands interviewed was from grade seven to 10 years of university, and that of the wives ranged from grade eight to six years of university. The mean number of years of education obtained by husbands was 4 years of university compared to two and a half years of university in the case of the wives. Fifty per cent of husbands in the sample had higher education than their wives compared to only 28 per cent of the wives who had higher education than their husbands. The power index of husbands and wives as obtained through Blood and Wolfe's (1960) decision power index was compared with comparative educational status of husbands and wives. The relationship between a husband's and wife's comparative educational status and the power enjoyed by them in decision making are presented in Tables I and II.

From the summary of results appearing in Table I it can be noted that there is a highly significant ($P<0.01$) relationship between the comparative educational status of husbands and the power enjoyed by them in making final decisions; that is, husbands with higher educational status than their wives enjoy more power in decision making. Table II shows the relationship between these two variables for the wives.

Table II indicates a positive relationship between the wife's comparative education and her power in marital decision making. The P-value obtained from this test shows that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. This supports the hypothesis.

Discussions:

Tables I and II illustrate that there is a significant relationship between the comparative educational status of husbands or wives and their power in decision making. The contribution of education to the power enjoyed by either

TABLE - I

Relationship between comparative educational status of a husband and his power in decision making.

Comparative educational status of husbands	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than wife	9	64.3	5	35.7
equal	4	36.4	7	63.6
more than wife	4	16.0	21	84.0

N=50, df=2, $\chi^2=9.23$, $P<0.01$

TABLE - II

Relationship between comparative educational status of a wife and her power in decision making.

Comparative educational status of wives	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than husband	4	16.0	21	84.0
equal	3	27.3	7	72.7
more than husband	9	64.3	5	35.7

N=50, df=2, $\chi^2=9.64$, $P<0.01$

husbands or wives may be explained in terms of the fact that higher education provides competence, knowledge, information and skills that are needed for life decisions. Possession of these skills and knowledge enables the individual to make contributions to marriage. They might competently participate in the decision making process and thereby convince their partners that they are equipped with extra skills. The other partner might therefore defer to their extra skills and knowledge. This reciprocatory process allows the partner that has higher education to make most of the decisions and to have more power in the decision making process. In addition, higher education contributes to the effective participation of husbands or wives in the community, which in turn strengthens their power positions in the home.

A similar kind of relationship was noted by Blood (1963) and Blood and Wolfe (1960) in their studies of Detroit families, as well as by Buric and Zecevic (1967); Heer (1963) and Michel (1967) . Safilios-Rothschild (1967) and Scanzoni (1970) also observed that the wife who has higher educational status than her husband enjoys more power.

An example illustrating the relationship between higher education and power in decision making is provided by a statement made by a woman respondent without a university degree married to a man who had a university degree. She says that "He knows more about money. He is more knowledgeable. He knows how much money we have; he is the head of the house."

HYPOTHESIS - 2

The higher the occupational status of one spouse compared to that of the other, the greater the power of that person in decision making.

Results:

The occupational status of the husbands studied varied from a brick-layer to a university professor, and that of the wives ranged from a sales clerk to a school teacher with a high percentage of the wives doing secretarial work. Blishen's (1967) scale of occupational class was used to arrange the husbands and wives in the order of high and low status occupations. Accordingly the occupational status of the husbands ranged from 2 to 6 and that of the wives from 2 to 7. The students and the homemakers were eliminated from this analysis because it was hard to assess their occupational status. The relationship between the comparative occupational status of the husbands and wives and their power in decision making are presented in Tables III and IV.

The value of chi square obtained in Table III shows

TABLE - III

Relationship between comparative occupational status of a husband and the power enjoyed by him in decision making.

Comparative occupational status of husbands	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than wife	9	64.3	5	35.7
equal	2	50.0	2	50.0
more than wife	4	22.2	14	77.8

N=36, df=2, χ^2=5.99, P<0.05

TABLE - IV

Relationship between comparative occupational status of a wife and the power enjoyed by her in decision making.

Comparative occupational status of wives	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than husband	4	22.2	14	77.8
equal	1	25.0	3	75.0
more than husband	8	57.1	6	42.9

N=36, df=2, χ^2=4.28, P<0.10

that there is a significant $(P<0.05)$ relationship between the comparative occupational status of husbands and the power enjoyed by them in marital decision making. In other words, husbands with higher occupational status than their wives enjoy more power in decision making than their wives. The relationship between these two variables for the wives is shown in Table IV.

Though the results presented in Table IV reveal that there is no significant relationship between the comparative occupational status of wives and their power in decision making, the table indicates that there is a clear trend in this direction. As can be observed from Table IV traditional power relations were reported by 77.8 percent of the wives who have lower occupational status than their husbands, whereas only 22.2 percent of these wives see themselves as having equal power with their husbands while making decisions.

Discussions:

It is interesting to note from Tables III and IV that the spouse who has higher occupational status enjoys more power in decision making than the other partner in making decisions. This may be due to the fact that occupational status gives prestige and enhances one's position in the community. The prestige of the family in the community will also depend on the occupational status of both the husband and wife. Realizing this the other partner may defer to him/her in the decision making process, this could also be explained in terms of the fact that higher occupational status requires better educational qualifications which seem to provide an individual with the necessary skills and information to participate effectively in the decision making process. This in essence gives them competence and proves their worth to their partners. This in turn would enable the spouse having higher occupational status to enjoy more power than their partners while making decisions. Another obvious reason is that the higher occupational status provides self-confidence in the concerned spouse and respect in the eyes of the partner. Moreover, the individual accustomed to responsible roles on the job would understandably be inclined to take responsibility in the home. In addition, higher occupational status jobs may involve reliance on the interpersonal skills of discussion and arguement which are involved in decision making. As a result of such factors, the spouse with higher occupational status is extra equipped with the knowledge and skills required for decision making.

These findings support the resource theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960). A similar kind of relationship was noted by Blood (1963); Heer (1963); Michel (1967); Oppong (1970) and Rodman (1967).

HYPOTHESIS - 3

The higher the income earned by one spouse compared to the other, the greater that partner's power in making decisions.

Results:

Incomes were measured in terms of dollars per year. The main incomes of male respondents varied from $5,500 to $20,000 with the mean being $10,369. The minimum amount was earned by a graduate student and the maximum by a truck driver. The main incomes of the female respondents ranged from $1,500 to $12,000 with the mean being $6,256. Eighty-four per cent of the husbands in the sample were earning more income than the wives when compared to only 12 per cent of the wives who were earning more than their husbands. The relationship between the income earned by the husband compared to his wife and the power enjoyed by him in decision making is shown in Table V.

Table V is indicative of the fact that there is no significant relationship between the comparative incomes of husbands and the power enjoyed by them in decision making. However, looking at the group of husbands who earn more than their wives, there is a clear trend in this direction. Sixty-nine percent of the husbands earning more income than their wives in fact enjoy more power in the

TABLE - V

Relationship between the comparative annual income of husband and the power enjoyed by him in decision making.

Comparative income of husbands	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than wife	3	50.0	3	50.0
equal	1	50.0	1	50.0
more than wife	13	31.0	29	69.0

N=50, df=2, $\chi^2=1.31$, P>0.50

TABLE - VI

Relationship between the comparative annual income of wife and the power enjoyed by her in decision making.

Comparative income of wives	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
less than husband	12	28.6	30	71.4
equal	1	50.0	1	50.0
more than husband	3	50.0	3	50.0

N=50, df=2, $\chi^2=0.54$, P>0.90

decision making process whereas only 31 percent of the husbands earning more income than their wives enjoy either equal or less amounts of power when compared to their wives. The relationship between these two variables among the wives is illustrated in Table VI.

Though the Chi square value obtained (0.54) shows that there is no significant relationship between the comparative annual income of wives and their power in making decisions, it is apparent from Table VI that there is a trend in the direction of wives earning less income to enjoy less power. As might be noticed from Table VI, 71 per cent of the wives earning less income than their husbands report that the husband makes the decisions more than themselves or that the husband always makes them. Only 28.6 per cent of the wives earning less income than their husbands see themselves as having equal power as their husbands in making decisions.

Discussions:

The trend observed in Tables V and VI support the hypothesis even though the tests are not significant. This kind of positive relationship can be explained in terms of the fact that money is a direct resource to the family, the means whereby material needs of family members are satisfied. A greater contribution of this resource to a marriage automatically enables the contributor of this resource to enjoy more power, because, the other partner depends on this spouse for the satisfaction of needs. It could also be argued that since all the decisions studied were financial decisions it would follow that the person who earns the most would be more likely to enjoy more power in making these decisions.

A similar kind of relationship was observed by Blood (1963); Blood and Wolfe (1960); Heer (1963); Lupri (1969); Michel (1967); Oppong (1970); Rodman (1967).

Comments made by some of the male and female respondents highlight the relationship between the comparative income earned by the spouses and their power in decision making:

One husband said "she feels that since I earn more, I am more responsible for spending it. She believes that I should decide finally. I am the head of the home. I am the leader."

An unemployed homemaker with a pre-school child said "When I was working we both handled the money. Now that I am at home, my husband handles the money for our monthly spending. I feel that since he works and earns, he should have more say than I do."

One woman respondent who worked part-time and made only $3,200 a year said, "He is a good provider. I should let him go ahead in making decisions."

A gainfully employed homemaker whose husband earned more than her said, "When there is too much money involved, or if it is his area, it is entirely up to him."

When asked why a particular decision process was not typical during their participation in the game, a husband who had a working wife that earned less than him replied, "If things are not terribly important then I don't have to get involved too much. If there is too much money, I would have to get involved; because, for financial things I am more responsible to the family. I am the bread winner."

Two husbands whose wives do not work expressed:

"I handle the money because I have the money. She is not working."

"I am earning money. She does not work. Usually whatever I say will happen."

All these statements clearly illustrate some of the reasoning behind the relationship between higher income and higher power in financial decisions.

HYPOTHESIS - 4

The greater the frequency with which a husband participates in community organizations the greater his power in decision making.

Results:

Husbands in the study were attending 1 to 6 organizations. The mean number of organizations in which the husbands participated was 2.2. Thirty percent of the husbands were attending these organizations once a week or more often and only 10 per cent of the husbands never attended these organizations. The relationship between the frequency of attending the organizations and the power enjoyed by the husbands is shown in Table VII.

It is evident from Table VII that there is a significant ($P<0.05$) relationship between the frequency of attending organizations and the power enjoyed by them in making decisions. The greater the frequency with which a husband attends the community organizations, the greater his power in making decisions. Although the relationship is clear cut for the husbands attending outside organizations with greater frequency, the trend is not clear cut in the case of husbands who attend organizations with a low frequency, having 58 per cent of these husbands enjoying more power than their wives.

Discussions:

It is very interesting to note the impact of community participation on the amount of power enjoyed by husbands. It could be that participation in community organizations brings knowledge or prestige pertinent to settling household issues. Moreover, as Blood and Wolfe (1960) put it, a person who has enough initiative to be active in the community

TABLE - VII

Relationship between the frequency of attending the organizatons and the power enjoyed by husbands in decision making.

Frequency of attending the organizations	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
low frequency	13	41.9	18	58.1
high frequency	1	7.1	13	92.9

N=45, df=1, $\chi^2=4.38$, $P<0.05$

seems also more likely to participate actively in family decision making. Besides this, frequent outside contacts enable the husbands to meet people, discuss life situations with them and thereby acquire skills in solving the real life problems at home. In essence, the competence they acquire in terms of skills and knowledge by attending outside organizations would enable them to enjoy more power in the decision making process.

Blood and Wolfe (1960) did not ask for information on the frequency with which the husbands attended organizational meetings. However, they found that the frequency of church attendance and membership in organizations was a source of power in making decisions.

HYPOTHESIS - 5

The older a husband is, the more traditional he is in making decisions.

Results:

The ages of husbands interviewed range from 24 to 55 with the mean being 32.5 years. The mean age was taken as the breaking point to group the husbands into the categories of younger and older. The power index of these husbands was compared to determine the impact of age on their power positions. The results of this analysis are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE - VIII

Relationship between husband's age and his power in decision making.

Age of husbands	Power in decision making			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	n	%	n	%
younger (24-33 yrs.)	6	27.3	16	72.7
older (34-55 yrs.)	8	28.6	20	71.4

N=50, df=1, χ^2=0.01, P>0.90

It is quite clear from Table VIII that there is no significant relationship between the husband's age and his power relations. Older husbands do not enjoy more power in the family, thus the hypothesis is not supported.

Discussions:

For this sample of husbands and wives, age does not seem to be a very powerful resource in decision making. This is quite in keeping with the view in the North American culture. In addition, a further reason for the non-existence of a significant relationship between age and power may be that the range in the ages of husbands in this sample is not great. Most of the husbands in the sample were between the ages of 30 and 40. Only two husbands were over fifty years of age, and they were atypical, in that, they had either a late marriage or had been married more than once. Both of these men expressed equalitarian attitudes.

A husband who had a second marriage says, "We made an oath to each other that problems will be divided and differences talked over. I did not marry her for sex alone."

An older husband who married late in life says, "We are married late in life; we try hard to get rid of that lonely life, to share enjoyment. We are both lonely. We found companionship in each other."

These findings do not support those of Blood and Wolfe

(1960) who found a direct relationship. It could be that in a sample of this nature test of a hypothesis related to comparative ages of husband and wife would be of more interest than mere differences in age alone.

HYPOTHESIS - 6

Husbands enjoy more power than their wives in financial decision making.

Results:

This hypothesis was tested by combining the responses of both the husbands and wives to the question, who makes the final decision about the various decisions included in the study. The summary of the data is presented in Table IX.

A close look at Table IX indicates that, while making the final decision about the car, 54 per cent of the respondents report that the husbands make them more than the wives or that the husbands make them alone, 45 per cent indicated that they decided about it together and only 1 per cent express that the wife does it more than the husband. Taking an aggregate balance of power, it is apparent that the husbands actually enjoy more power in this area. Similarly, while making decisions regarding life insurance, it is evident that in 46 per cent of the cases husbands decide about it more than their wives or that they make it always and in 47 per cent of the cases the husband and wife

TABLE - IX

Percentages of spousal views of power related to decision making situations.

1. Spouses job 2. Car 3. Insurance
4. Vacation 5. House 6. Own work
7. Doctor 8. Food

H: husband W: wife

who decides	1		2	3	4	5	6		7	8
	H	W					H	W		
husband always or more than wife	7	31	54	46	8	5	19	4	4	9
husband and wife exactly the same	21	17	45	47	88	73	28	31	60	49
wife always or more than husband	22	2	1	6	4	12	3	15	36	42
not applicable				1						
total	50	50	100	100	100	100	50	50	100	100

decide about it together and only in 6 per cent of the cases the wife makes those decisions more than their husbands. The data thus suggest that the husbands have more power while making decisions regarding life insurance. In the case of going on vacation and choosing a house both the husbands and wives seem to have equal amount of power with 88 and 73 per cent of the respondents indicating that they decide about these two issues together. In the case of selecting a doctor it is found that, in 60 per cent of the cases the decision is made together, in 36 per cent of the cases it is made by the wife more than the husband or that she makes it alone and only in 4 per cent of the cases the husbands decide about it more than their wives. All these illustrate that the wife enjoys more power in this area. Similarly, while making decisions regarding the amount of money to be spent on food, in 49 per cent of the cases this seems to be a joint decision and in 42 per cent of the cases the wife makes this decision more than her husband or that she makes it alone, while only in 9 per cent of the cases the husbands seem to make it more than their wives. These findings again indicate that the aggregate balance of power falls in the direction of the husband.

Discussions:

It is clear from Table IX that two decisions are primarily the husband's province (the car and insurance), two the wife's (food and doctor) and two are joint decisions (house and vacation).

The distribution of power in making these decisions appears to be based on sex. As Blood and Wolfe (1960) put it automobiles are associated with the mechanical aptitude of males. Moreover, the possession of a particular automobile is often associated with male status and ego symbols. The fact that insurance decisions are made more often by husbands may reflect the technical financial questions involved, and also is a reflection of the cultural tradition of life insurance being only for males.

At the other extreme, meal planning is part of the traditional wife's role in the division of labor, giving the wife the major responsibility of expenditures on food. Again the traditional nurturant role assignment to women seems to account for the active participation in deciding about the doctor. Support for these findings comes from Safilios-Rothschild (1967).

Husbands appear to decide independently the job that they should take. Only 17 Of 50 wives indicate that they discuss about this matter with their husbands. On the other hand, 56 per cent of the husbands share either more or equal amounts of power with their wives in making decisions regarding the type of work the wife should take. Similarly, more husbands (70%) than wives (62%) influence the decision of whether the other partner should go to work or not. The obvious reason for this is that, if a woman takes up a job outside the home, the traditional pattern of household tasks and family decision making would change and the role of the husband would change drastically.

Given these eight particular decisions, the aggregate balance of power falls slightly in the husbands direction. The hypothesis that husbands in general have more power than their wives is supported by the data. The hypothesis also gets some support from the answers to the question "when there is a disagreement regarding spending money who usually gives in?" Twenty-four per cent said that the wife gives in, 8 per cent said that the husband gives in and 62 percent said that they both would come to a compromise.

The findings of this study are very similar to those of Blood and Wolfe (1960). Change in the power positions of husbands and wives over the past 14 years has not been significant inspite of the movement to employment outside the home on the part of married women and the strong advocation of egalitarian principles in the past feminist movement.

The comments made by both the male and female respondents in the study explain why the husbands in this sample have more power than the wives. Some of the women commented:

"He is the head of the household. Husband should have the final say."

"Husbands are usually more practical than wives and they make better decisions."

"I feel that husband should be the boss of the house."

Some men in the study said:

"It is the husband's role to decide finally and to be the leader for household. He should be given top place in marriage."

"Husband has the right to make final decisions. Man of the house should make final decisions."

These comments of both the female and male respondents reveal some reasons why the husbands in the study have more power than their wives.

HYPOTHESIS - 7

A husband's perceptions of power bears no relationship to his wife's perceptions of marital power.

Results:

In order to see how far a husband's and his wife's perceptions of marital decision power was similar or different Spearman's rank order correlation is done. It is interesting to note from the results that there is a high agreement between a husband's and his wife's perceptions of power in decision making. The rs value (0.634) indicates that 36 per cent of the variability is accounted for. The z value (4.438) reveals that these results are significant at 0.001 level.

When asked "who usually gives in when a disagreement arises regarding spending money?" the following kinds of responses were obtained from husbands and wives (Table X).

It is very interesting to note in Table X, more wives (28%) than the husbands (20%) think that the wife gives in when a disagreement arises and more husbands (66%) than wives (58%) think that they come to a compromise. This could be because husbands want to give a socially acceptable response. On the other hand the reason that wives accord less power to themselves than to their husbands could be explained in terms of earlier research findings which record that "Spouses accord less power for themselves and more to their partners" (Heer, 1962; Kenkel, 1957; Safilios-Rothschild, 1967). However, the differences between the husbands and wives responses are not great.

Discussions:

The data presented here dces not indicate any major difference between the husbands and wives perceptions of family power structure. This could be very well explained in terms of the awareness on the part of husbands and wives of what they do in their daily life and the consciousness with which they do them. This kind of agreement is indicative of

TABLE - X

The pattern of giving in as per husbands' and wives' resonses.

1. Wife gives in
2. Husband gives in
3. Neither gives in
4. Compromise
5. Do not differ

Respondents	Pattern of giving in 1		2		3		4		5	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Husbands	10	20	4	8	-	-	33	66	3	6
Wives	14	28	4	8	1	2	29	58	2	4

the fact that power as an issue is being recognized by husbands and wives and that they think, talk, negotiate and decide about it when they get married. These similarities could also be explained in terms of the practicality of the decisions included in the study. Since all the decisions are important to family, husbands and wives could be quite aware of them and know the spouse who in fact makes these decisions.

The length of marriage (5-10 years) being one of the controlling factors in the selection of the sample, would have had great impact on the husbands and wives, in accurately realizing their power relations. It could also have been due to the fact that, there are not much differences in the ages of a husband and wife in a marriage (Larson, 1972).

Another obvious reason is that there cannot be any room for misperception of decision making power because a high percentage (78%) of women work outside the home, which equips them with a clear understanding of who does what in the family. This finding differs from the findings of several research studies (Burchinal and Bauder, 1965; Granbois and Willet, 1970; Heer, 1962; Larson, 1972; Olson and Rabunsky, 1972 and others) which indicated that husbands' perceptions of power are different from that of the wives.

HYPOTHESIS - 8

Neither a husband's or a wife's attitudes to decision power, nor their perceptions of power in decision making bears any relationship to their decision making behavior.

Results:

To test this hypothesis a portion of the sample (10 families) participated in a game (see Appendix V). The power perception scores of husbands and wives as obtained by the Decision Power Index were compared with the attitude scores for husbands and wives as measured by Dunn's Authority Sub-Scale (1960). These two scores in turn were compared with the actual behavior of the participating husbands and wives as determined by the game analysed using Bales Interaction Process Analysis. The comparison between perceptual and attitudinal power relations of husbands and wives are shown in Table XI.

Table XI makes it evident that there are no similarities between the attitudinal and perceptual powers either among husbands or among wives. It can be noted from Table XI that 61 per cent of husbands with egalitarian attitudes in fact perceive that they enjoy more power in decision making. Similarly, 64 percent of wives with egalitarian attitudes perceive that they enjoy less power than their husbands in making decisions. This makes it quite

TABLE - XI

Percentage comparison between the perceptual and attitudinal power scores of husbands and wives.

H: Husband   W: Wife

Attitudes	Perceived power of husbands and wives							
	Low self power				High self power			
	H (8-24)		W (25-40)		H (25-40)		W (8-24)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Traditional (1-6)	2	17	6	100	10	83	-	-
Equalitarian (7 -11)	15	40	28	64	23	61	16	36

clear that there are no similarities between the attitudinal and perceived power relations among the husbands as well as wives.

The perceived and attitudinal powers were compared with the actual behavior of the couples who participated in the game. For the sake of convenience, the perceived and attitudinal powers are compared with actual behavior separately and are presented in separate Tables (Tables XII and XIII).

Table XII shows that there is no relationship between the perceived and behavioral power relations either among the husbands or among wives. Three out of four husbands who in fact said that they have equalitarian power relations dominated their wives during the decision process. Similarly, 3 out of 5 wives who perceive themselves as having equal or more power than their husbands in fact made fewer decisions than their husbands during the game period.

The actual behavior of spouses is also measured in terms of the number of wishes actually reflected in the final decisions and these are compared with the perceived and attitudinal power relations. (Table XIII)

A close look at Table XIII illustrates that there are no similarities between the perceived and actual power relations either among husbands or among the wives. All the

TABLE - XII

Comaprision between the behavioral and perceived power relations of husbands and wives.

H: Husband W: Wife

Number of decisions actually made	Perceived power of spouses			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	H	W	H	W
more than spouse	3	2	4	-
equal	-	-	1	1
less than spouse	1	3	1	4

N = 20

TABLE - XIII

Comaprision between the behavioral and perceived power relations of husbands and wives.

H: Husband W: Wife

Number of wishes actually reflected in final decisions	Perceived power of spouses			
	Equalitarian (8-24)		Traditional (25-40)	
	H	W	H	W
more than spouse	4	1	3	-
equal	-	-	2	2
less than spouse	-	4	1	3

N = 20

husbands who said that they have equalitarian power relations tried to influence their wives and get their wishes reflected in the final decisions during the game session. Similarly 4 out of 5 wives who perceived themselves as having equal power with their husbands failed to get their wishes fulfilled in the decision making process. This analysis again reaffirms that the perceived power relations are different from actual behavior.

The actual behavior of the husbands and wives was compared with the attitudinal power index in order to see whether they were consistent with each other. The summary of this data are presented in the following Tables. (Tables XIV and XV).

As can be observed from Table XIV, six out of the eight husbands who expressed egalitarian attitudes dominated their wives in the decision making process and made more final decisions than their wives. Similarly 6 out of the 9 wives with egalitarian attitudes were submissive to their husbands during the decision process. This clearly illustrates that the attitudes are different from actual behavior.

The actual power as measured through the number of wishes actually reflected in the decision making process was compared with the attitudes of both the husbands and wives as shown in Table XV, to see whether they are similar of different.

TABLE - XIV

Comaprision between the behavioral and attitudinal power relations of husbands and wives.

H: Husband W: Wife

Number of decisions actually made	Attitudes			
	Equalitarian (7-11)		Traditional (1- 6)	
	H	W	H	W
more than spouse	6	2	1	-
equal	1	1	-	-
less than spouse	1	6	1	1

N = 20

TABLE - XV

Comaprision between the behavioral and attitudinal power relations of husbands and wives.

H: Husband W: Wife

Number of wishes actually reflected in final decisions	Attitudes			
	Equalitarian (7-11)		Traditional (1-6)	
	H	W	H	W
more than spouse	5	1	2	-
equal	2	2	-	-
less than spouse	1	6	-	1

N = 20

Table XV reveals that there are no similarities between the attitudes towards power relations and actual power relations either among husbands or among the wives. As can be noted from Table XV, five out of eight husbands with equalitarian attitudes could manage to get their wishes reflected in the final decisions during the decision process. Similarly six out of nine wives with egalitarian attitudes failed to get their wishes reflected in the final decisions during the game period. This again indicates that the respondents are liberal in their attitudes than in their behavior.

Discussions:

This data underlines the fact that attitudes are different from both the perceived and actual behavior. Support for these findings can be found in several research studies (DeFleur and Westie, 1958; Deutscher, 1966; Doob, 1947; Fishbein, 1971; Landy, 1966; LaPiere, 1934; Triandis and Triandis, 1960; and Wicker, 1969). It can be explained in terms of what Ogburn (1955) calls the "culture lag". Husbands and wives may have quite liberal attitudes because they live in a permissive society where equalitarianism is the norm. However, for these attitudes to be assimilated into their systems and be reflected in their actions it takes more time. Similarly the lack of agreement between the perceived and actual behavior could be explained in terms of the fact that people perceive through a bias. Perceptions of one's behavior depends on self-esteem and the attitudes with which they look at the situation. It could be speculated that they might have responded to the attitudinal scale on the basis of what they want to happen, for the perceptual scale on the basis of how they would like it to be, and during the actual decision period they would have exhibited their actual behavior. This study supports previous findings and indicates that there is very little agreement between self report and behavioral measures of family power.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine which factors influence the power relations of husbands and wives and thereby to test the Resource Theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960) with a few conceptual and methodological improvements.

Specifically, the research questions asked were:

(1) Will higher education, income and occupational status of a spouse (in comparison with the other) enhance the power possessions of that person in decision making?

(2) Does the frequency of attending community organizations influence the power possession of a husband in the decision making process?

(3) Are older husbands more traditional than younger husbands?

(4) Is it true that husbands have more power in decision making than their wives?

(5) Do the perceptions of power relations of a husband and his wife differ?

(6) Are there any similarities between the perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral powers of either a husband or a

wife?

As an attempt to get the answers to these questions, several methodological improvements were included in the research. Only marital decision making power in the financial arena was studied using the responses of both husbands' and wives', and survey as well as observational techniqueswere utilized.

The sample was controlled for intact, middle income families, married between 5 and 10 years and having no adolescent children. The data was obtained by a male and a female interviewer.

B. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study suggest the following conclusions:

(1) The higher the educational status of a spouse, compared to that of the other, the greater that persons power in decision making.

(2) The higher the occupational status of a spouse, compared to that of the other, the greater that person's power in making decisions.

(3) The greater the income earned by a spouse, in comparison with the other, the greater that person's power in decision making.

(4) The greater the frequency with which a husband

participates in community organizations, the greater his power in marital decision making.

(5) Older husbands do not enjoy more power in making decisions than younger husbands.

(6) Husbands tend to have slightly more power in the over-all decision making process than their wives.

(7) There is close agreement between a husband's and his wife's perceptions of power.

(8) Neither a husband's or a wife's attitudes to decision power, nor their perceptions of power in decision making bear any relationship to their decision making behavior.

C. LIMITATIONS

The findings of this research must be measured in terms of the limitations experienced in designing the research and carrying it out.

(1) The analysis of the data indicates taht this small sample is not representative of the total Canadian society in terms of their higher educational status, age range and greater percentage of wives working.

(2) The game was very simple and actual behavior was audio recorded, not observed, while the couples participated in the game.

(3) The randomness of the sample could be questioned because, of the randomly selected couples only those who were willing to be the subjects were included in the study.

D. IMPLICATIONS

The study suggests several implications for further research on marital decision power:

(1) The existence of positive relationships between comparative educational status, income and occupational status and the power enjoyed by the spouse indicate that it is the comparative resources that the partners bring into a marital relationship that is highly important because power is a matter of mutual concern.

(2) The presence of a highly significant relationship between the comparative educational status and power in decision making and not so significant relationship between comparative incomes and power in decision making suggest the differences in the importance of each of these resources to the couples. Therefore, it appears that it is important to see the impact of each of these resources separately rather than seeing the impact of socio-economic status on spousal power relations; and also to find out which of these variables is the most valuable one to the acquisition of power in decision making.

(3) It would be interesting to know why active participation in community organizations enhances husbands power. This need not be because of the fact that he attends these organizations regularly, it could be due to the fact that he acquires information, knowledge and skills which are assets while making decisions in the household.

(4) The finding that husbands tend to have slightly more power than their wives in decision making suggests that it is important to note the areas of decision making in which the husbands dominate and the areas where wives dominate. Once this is ascertained, it is then important to determine which of these decision areas each considers as important to the family and which are not. This would give a better indication of spousal power relations.

(5) The little correspondence between the perceptual, attitudinal and behavioral power relations either among husbands or among wives suggests that relying predominantly on the self report approach and predicting the spousal power relations from their perceptions and attitudes is both unscientific and misleading.

(6) This research sheds no light on which of the two approaches (self report and observation) is the most valid to the study of family power. A combination of these two approaches with the possibility of deriving an index to describe family power relations would be the best thing to use.

This study is, therefore, only a beginning step in the direction of comprehensive methodological improvements for studying the power relations of families. This research does however, reinforce the idea that methodological research should precede, rather than follow substantive research in the field of marital power.

In conclusion, it seems that the study of marital power will not become more sophisticated and valid until the methodology of power structure studies improves considerably to include a detailed study of all aspects and all types of power from the point of view of all contributing family members (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970).

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND APPENDICES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLPORT, G. W. "Attitudes." In C. Murschison (ed.), A Handbook of Social Psychology. Clark University Press. 1935.

BAHR, S. J., "SIMFAM as a measure of conjugal power." Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations Meetings, Washington, D.C., October 1969. PP. 1-25.

BAHR, S.J. "Comment on the study of family power structure: a review 1960-1969." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 2, (May) 1972. PP. 239-243.

BAHR, S. J. and B. C. Rollins. "Crises and conjugal power." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 33, No. 2, (May) 1971. PP. 360-367.

BALES, R. F. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method For The Study of Small Groups. Cambridge : Addison Wesley Press. Inc. 1950. P. 9.

BERTRAND, A. L. Rural Sociology. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company. 1958. P. 200.

BLAU, P. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1964.

BLISHEN, B. R. " An analysis of social class and power in Canada." In J. Porter (ed.), Vertical Mossaic. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press. 1967. PP. 160-164.

BLOOD, R.O. "The measurement and bases of family power : a rejoinder." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 25, No. 4, (November) 1963. PP. 475-476.

BLOOD, R. O. Love Match and Arranged Marriages. New York: The Free Press. 1967.

BLOOD, R. O. and R. L. Hamblin. "The effect of the wife's employment on the family power structure." Social Forces. Vol. 36 (May) 1958. P. 348.

BLOOD, R. O. and Y.J. Takeshita. " Development of cross cultural equivalance of measures of marital interaction for U.S.A. and Japan." Transactions of the fifth world congrss of sociology. Vol.4, 1964. PP. 333-344.

BLOOD, R. O. and D. M. Wolfe. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Glencoe: The Free Press 1960. PP. 11-46.

BOWERMAN, C. E. and G. H. Elder. "Adolescent perception of family power structure." American Sociological Review. Vol. 29, No. 4, (August) 1964. PP. 551-567.

BUCKLEY, W. Sociology of Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1967.

BURCHINAL, L. G. and W. W. Bauder. "Decision-making patterns among Iowa farm and non-farm families." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 27, No. 4, (November) 1965. PP. 525-530.

BURIC, G. and A. Zecevic. "Family authority, marital satisfaction, and the social network in Yugoslavia." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, No. 2, (May) 1967. PP. 325-326.

BURGESS, E. W., H. J. Locke and M. M. Thomes. The Family from Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1963.

BURR, W. R. Theory Construction and Sociology of the Family. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1973. PP. 188-197.

CENTERS, R., B. H. Raven and A. Rodgers. "Conjugal power structure: a reexamination." American Sociological Review. Vol. 36, Part 1, (April) 1971. PP. 264-277.

CROMWELL, R. E. "Multivariate explorations in marital and family power structure: toward a theoretical and methodological clarification of power as a dependent variable." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Minnesota. 1972.

DeFLEUR, M. L. and F. R. Westie. "Verbal attitudes and overt acts: an experiment on the salience of attitudes." American Sociological Review. Vol. 23, 1958. PP. 667-73.

DEUTSCHER, I. "Words and deeds: social science and social policy." Social Problems. Vol. 13, 1966. PP. 235-65.

DOOB, L. W. "The behavior of attitudes." Psychological Review. Vol. 54, 1947. PP. 135-156.

DUNN, M. "Marriage role expectations of adolescents." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 22, No. 2, (May) 1960. PP. 99-111.

DYER, W. G. and D. Urban. "The institutionalization of equalitarian family norms." Journal of Marriage and the

Family. Vol. 20, No. 1, (February) 1958. PP. 53-58.

EDWARDS, J. N. "Familial behavior as social exchange." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 3, (August) 1969. PP. 518-526.

EVANS, R. H. and N. R. Smith. "A selected paradigm of family behavior." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 3, (August) 1969. PP. 512-517.

FARINA, A. and R. M. Dunham. "Measurement of family relationships and their effects." Archives of General Psychiatry. Vol. 9, (July) 1963. PP. 64-73.

FELDMAN, H. The Ghanaian Family in Transition. Winneba Training College, and Cornel University. 1967.

FERBER, R. "Family decision making and economic behavior." Institute of Life Insurance. 1971. PP. 1-56.

FERREIRA, A. J. and W. D. Winter. "Family interaction and decision-making." Archives of General Psychiatry. Vol. 13, (September) 1965. PP. 214-223.

FISHBEIN, M. "The search for attitudinal-behavioral consistency." In J. Cohen (ed.), Behavioral Science Foundations of Consumer Behaviors. New York: Free Press, 1971.

FITZIMMONS, C. and N. L. Perkins. "Patterns of family relationships in fifty farm families." Rural Sociology. Vol. 12, (September) 1947. PP. 300-303.

GECAS, V. and R. Libby. "Sexual behavior as symbolic inter action." Unpublished manuscript 1972.

GILLESPIE, D. L. "Who has the power? the marital struggle." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 33, (August) 1971. PP. 445-458.

GOULDNER, A. W. "The norm of receprocity." American Sociological Review. Vol. 25 (April) 1960. PP. 161-178.

GRANBOIS, D. H. and R. P. Willett. "Equivalence of family role measures based on husband and wife data." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 32, No. 1, (February) 1970. PP. 68-72.

HEER, D. M. 'Dominance and the working wife." Social Forces. Vol. 36, (May) 1958. PP. 341-347.

HEER, D. M. "Husband and wife perceptions of family power structure." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 24, No. 1, (February) 1962. PP, 65-67.

HEER, D. M. "The measurement and bases of family power: an over view." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 25, No, 2, (May) 1963. PP. 133-138.

HEER, D. M. "Reply by D. M. Heer." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 25, No. 4 (November) 1963. P. 407.

HERBST, P. G. "Family living-patterns of interaction." In O. A. Olser and S. B. Hammond (eds.), Social Structure and Personality in a City. New York: MacMillan Company. 1954.

HESS, R. D. and J. V. Torney "Religion, age and sex in children's perceptions of family authority." Child Development. Vol. 33, (December) 1962. PP. 781-789.

HESS, R. D. and J. V. Torney. "A comparison of methods used to measure family power structure." Paper presented at the Symposium on Family Structure and Socialization. Society for Research In Child Development. Berkeley 1963.

HILL, R. "Decision making and the family life cycle." In E. Shanas and G. F. Streib (eds.), Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

HONEY, R ,V. Britton and A. S. Hotchkiss. "Decision making in the use of family financial resources." Pennsylvania Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin. No. 643. 1953. PP. 38-39.

INGERSOLL, H. L. "Study of the transmission of authority patterns in the family." Genetic Psychology Monograph. Vol. 38, (November) 1948. PP. 225-302.

JOHANNIS, T. B. "The adolescent's view of the father's roles in relation to socio-economic class." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Florida: The Florida State University. 1955. P. 18.

JOHNSON, C. L. "Authority and power in Japanese-American marriage." Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations Meetings. Toronto, 1973. PP. 1-20.

KANDEL, D. B. and G. S. Lasser. "Marital decision making in American and Danish urban families: a research note." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 1. (February) 1972. PP. 134-138.

KARLSSON, G. "Reliability of data obtained on family authority with a culture free instrument." Transactions of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, Vol. IV, World Congress of Sociology. Washington, D. C., I.S.A. 1964.

KENKEL, W. F. "Influence differentiation in family decision making." Sociology and Social Research. Vol. 42, (September-October) 1957. PP. 18-25.

KENKEL, W. F. "Sex of observer on spousal roles in decision making." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 23, No. 2, (May) 1961. PP. 185-186.

KENKEL, W. F. "Family interaction in decision making on spending." In N. N. Foote (Ed.) Household Decision Making. New York: New York University Press. 1961. P. 141.

KENKEL, W. F. "Observational studies of husband-wife interaction in family decision-making". In M. B. Sussman (ed.), Source-book in Marriage and the Family, second edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1963.

KING, K. "Adolescent perceptions of power structure in the Negro family." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 4, (November) 1969. PP. 751-755.

KLIGLER, D. S. "The effect of employment of married women on husband and wife roles: a study in cultural change." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Yale University. 1954. P. 9.

KOMAROVSKY, M. The Blue Collar Marriage. New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House. 1967. PP. 220-235.

KOMAROVSKY, M. "Class differences in family decision making on expenditures."In N. N. Foote (Ed.), Household Decision Making. New York: New York University Press. 1967. PP. 255-265.

LAMOUS, A. "Family roles of women: a German example." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 1, (February) 1969. PP. 145-152.

LANDY, E. "An investigation of the relationships between attitude and two classes of overt behavior." Unpublished master's thesis. Univ. of Illinois. 1966.

LaPIERE, R. T. "Attitudes vs. actions." Social Forces. Vol. 13, 1934. PP. 230-37.

LARSON, L. E. "Systems perception of family power and problem solving processes." Paper presented at the annual meetings of National Council on Family Relations. 1972. PP. 1-20.

LARSON, L. E. and T. B. Johannis. "Religious perspective and the authority structure of the family." Pacific Sociological Review. Vol. 10, No. 1, (Spring) 1967. PP. 13-22.

LIU, W. T., I. W. Hutchison, and L. K. Hong. "Congugal power and decision making: a methodological note on cross cultural study of the family." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 79, 1973. PP. 84-98.

LIVELY, E. I. "Toward a concept clarification: the case of marital interaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 1, (February) 1969. PP. 108-114.

LOVEJOY, D. D. "College students perceptions of the roles of the husband and wife in family decision making."The Family Coordinator. Vol. 9, (March-June) 1969. PP. 43-46.

LUPRI, E. "Contemporary authority patterns of West German family: a study in cross national validation." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 1, (February) 1969. PP. 134 - 144.

MICHEL, A. "Comparative data concerning the interaction in French and American families."Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, No. 2, (May) 1967. PP. 337-344.

MIDDLETON, R. and S. W. Putney. "Dominance in decisions in family: race and class differences." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 65, (May) 1960. PP. 605-609.

MISHLER E. G. and N E. Waxler. Interaction in Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1968.

MOGEY, J. M. "A century of declining paternal authority." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 19, No. 3, (August) 1957. PP. 234-239.

MURSTEIN, B. I. (Ed.) Theories of Attraction and love. Springer Publishing Co., 1971.

NELSON, L. Rural Sociology, Second edition. New York: American Book Co., 1955. P. 205.

NIMKOFF, M. F. "The American family." in M. F. Nimkoff (ed.), Comparative Family Systems. Boston : Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965. PP. 329-340.

NYE, F. I. "Field research." in H. T. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family. 1964. PP. 247-274.

NYE, F. I. "Discussion of some notes on future theorizing and research." Unpublished manuscript. 1972.

OGBURN, W. F. Social Change. New York: Viking Press. 1922. PP. 200-213.

OGBURN, W. F. and M. F. Nimkoff. Technology and the changing Family. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1955. P.18.

OLSON, D. H. "Decision making in couples; a comparison of a self-report and behavioral measure of power." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. The Pennsylvania State Univ., Pennsylvania. 1967.

OLSON, D. H. "The measurement of family power by self-report and behavioral methods." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 3, (August) 1969. PP. 545-550.

OLSON, D. H. and C. Rabunsky. "Validity of four measures of family power." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 2, (May) 1972. PP. 234-232.

OPPONG, C. "Congjugal power and resources: an urban African example." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 32, No. 4, (November) 1970. PP. 676-680.

O'ROURKE, J. F. "Field and laboratory: the deciision making behavior of family groups in two experimental conditions." Sociometry. Vol. 26, (December) 1963. PP. 422-435.

PARSONS, T. Social Structure and Personality. New York: MacMillan Company. 1964.

PARSONS, T. and R. F. Bales. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1955.

PHELAN, J. M. and R. H. Ruef. "Values expressed and realized in family financial plans." Pennsylvania Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin No. 1885. 1960.

PHILLIPS, C. E. "Measuring power of spouse." Sociology and Social Research. Vol. 52, No. 1, (October) 1967. PP. 35-49.

RODMAN, H. "Marital power in France, Greece, Yugoslavia and the United States: A cross national discussion." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, No. 2, (May) 1967. PP. 320-324.

ROLLINS, J. M. "Two empirical tests of a Parsonion theory of family authority patterns." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 12, (January-April) 1963. PP. 3-18.

RYDER, R. G. "Three myths: Brief ruminations of interaction procedures while contemplating color matching test." Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations Meetings, Washington, D.C., October 1969. PP. 20-23.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "A comparison of power structure and marital satisfaction in urban Greek and French families." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, No. 2, (May) 1967. PP. 345-351.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "Patterns of familial power and influence." Sociological Focus. Vol. 2, (Spring) 1969. PP. 7-19.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "Family sociology or wives family sociology?: A cross-cultural examination of decision making." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 31, No. 2, (May) 1969. PP. 290-310.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "The study of family power structure: A review 1960-1969." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 32, No. 4, (November) 1970. PP. 535-549.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "The influence of the wife's degree of work on some aspects of family organization and dynamics." Journal of Marriage and the Family . Vol. 32, No. 4, (November) 1970. PP. 681-690.

SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD, C. "The dimensions of power distribution in the family." Paper presented at the NCFR annual meeting. 1972.

SCANZONI, J. "A note on the sufficiency of wife's responses in family research." Pacific Sociological Review. (Fall) 1965. PP. 109-115.

SCANZONI, J. H. Opportunity and the Family. New York: The Free Press. 1970.

SCHLESINGER, B. "A survey of methods used to study decision making in the family." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 11, No. 1, (January) 1962. PP. 8-14.

SECORD, P. R. and C. W. Backman. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1974.

SHARROCK, M. S. "A study of authority patterns in parent-child relations." Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. 1951. PP. 81-98.

SILVERMAN, W. and R. Hill. "Task allocation in marriage in the U.S. and Belgium." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, 1967. PP.353-359.

SMITH, H. L. "Intrafamilial decision-making and marital satisfaction." Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations Meetings, San Francisco. August 1967. PP. 16-19.

SPREY, J. "On the management of conflict in families." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 33, No. 4 (Nov.) 1971. PP. 722-731.

SPREY, J. "Family power structure: a critical comment." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 2 (May) 1972. PP. 235-238.

STRAUS, M. A. "Power and support structure of the family in relation to sociatization." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 26, No. 3, (August) 1964. PP. 318-326.

STRAUS, M. A. and I. Tallman. "SIMFAM: a technique for observational measurement and experimental study of families." Mimeographed working paper. Univ. of Minnesota. 1966.

STRODTBECK, F.L. "Husband-wife interaction over revealed difference." American Socilogical Review. Vol.16, 1951. PP. 468-473.

TAYLOR, C. C. Rural Life in U.S.A. New York: Salfred A. Knopf. 1949. PP. 44-45.

THEODERSON, G. A. and A. G. Theoderson. A Modern Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Cromwell. 1969.

TOWZARD, H. Enquete Psychosociologique Sur Les et la Structure Conjugale. Parris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 1967.

TRIANDIS, H. C. and L. M. Triandis, "Race, social class, religion and nationality as determinants of social distance." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. Vol. 61, 1960. PP. 110-118.

TROST, J. Unpublished data. 1969.

TURK, J. L. "The measurement of intra-family power." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Toronto. 1970.

TURK, J. L. "Use and abuse of power in the study of the family." Paper presented at the NCFR annual meetings. Toronto. 1973. PP. 1-25.

TURK, J. L. and N. W. Bell. "Measuring power in families." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 2, (May) 1972. PP. 215-219.

VAN ES, J. C. and P. M. Shingi, "Response consistency of husband and wife for selected attitudinal items." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, No. 4, (November) 1972. PP. 741-749 .

VOGEL, E. F. "The Japanese family" in M. F. Nimkoff (Ed.), Comparative Family Systems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1965. PP. 287-300.

WEBER, M. Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press. 1947.

WICKER, A. W. "Attitudes versus actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects." Journal of Social Issues. Vol. 25, 1969. PP. 41-78.

WILKENING, E. A. and L. K. Bharadwaj. "Dimensions of aspirations, work roles and decision-making among farm husbands and wives in Wisconsin." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 29, No. 4, (November) 1967. PP. 703-711.

WILKEING,E.A. and L.K. Bharadwaj. "Aspirations and task involvement as related to decision making among farm husbands and wives." Rural Socilogy. Vol.33, 1968, PP. 30-45.

WILKENING, E. A. and E. Lupri. "Decision-making in German and American families: A cross-cultural comparison." Sociologia Ruralis. Vol. 4, 1965. PP. 366-385.

WILKENING, E. A. and D. E. Morrison. "A comparison of husband and wife responses concerning who makes farm and home decisions." Journal of Maririage and the Family. Vol. 25, No. 3, (August) 1968. PP. 349-351.

WLADIS-HOFFMAN, L. "Effects of the employment of mothers on parental power relations and the division of household tasks." Journal of Maririage and the

Family. Vol. 22, No. 1, (February) 1960. PP. 27-35.

WOLFE, D. M. "Power and authority in the family." In D. Cartwright (ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. 1964. P. 99.

APPENDIX I

LETTER DESCRIBING THE STUDY

Dear Mr, Mrs. . . . .

As a graduate student in the division of Family Studies, School of Household Economics, University of Alberta, I am engaged in a research project for a masters degree. I am interested in finding out how husbands and wives make family decisions. I also want to know attitudes and feelings about a few areas which are generally important to families. As yet, little information has been collected in Canada. I would like you to answer the enclosed form and return it to me through campus mail as soon as possible. Upon receipt of this information, some of you will be selected as a sample for this study.

We feel that individuals who participate in research studies such as this one, contribute a great service to the acquisition of knowledge about families. Most participants find it an interesting experience.

All the answers you give are, of course, completely confidential. They will be used only in group statistics and comparisons. Please be assured that we will treat this data anonymously.

We appreciate your assistance in this research.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours

Indira Reddy.

P.S. By folding the form, my departmental address appears ready for mailing in campus mail.

APPENDIX II

PRELIMINARY SURVEY FORM

1. Marital status:

   a) Married

   b) Separated

   c) Divorced

   d) Widowed

   e) Other

2. How many years have you been married?

   a) 0 - 4

   b) 5 - 10

   c) 11 - 15

   d) 16 - 20

   e) 21 - 25

   f) 26 and over

3. How many children do you have?.........................

4. Ages of girls: ....., ..., ..., ..., ... years.

5. Ages of boys: ....., ..., ..., ..., ... years.

6. What is the approximate total annual income of your family ? (Please include all sources.)

a) $4000 - 6000
b) $7000 - 9000
c) $10,000 - 12,000
d) $13,000 - 15,000
e) $16,000 - 18,000
f) $19,000 - 21,000
g) $22,000 - 24,000
h) $25,000 and over

APPENDIX III

REMAINDER

Dear Mr/ Mrs

Two weeks ago we mailed you a Preliminary Survey Form for a study we are conducting on the non-academic staff of our university. Probably you laid the form aside thinking that you would fill it in at an other time; perhaps it is already in the mail. However, we are most anxious to develop our research and cannot proceed further until the response is complete. It is only to the extent that we receive complete response that our sample may validly represent the group.

We are enclosing an other copy of the survey form in the hope that you will take time to answer. Please do take time to fill it out and return it to us immediately if you have not already done so. We appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this research.

Sincerely yours

INDIRA REDDY

Enclosure

APPENDIX - IV

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Hello, I am Indira and this is my friend ---------. as you already know we are interested in finding out how husbands and wives make family decisions. We also want to know your feelings about a number of areas which are generally important to families. All the answers you give are completely cofidential. The only information we will use are averages of a large group of families. The interview will take only one hour. We are grateful to you for your kind cooperation in this research. In order to finish this work quickly I will interview --------------------- and ---------- will interview ---------------------- simultaneously.

PART I

This first part deals with the participation of people in community activities.

(1) One way in which some persons spend their time is in clubs and organizations. Please look at this list and tell me the number and kinds of organizations you belong to if any.

- (a) church connected groups
- (b) work connected organization
- (c) school connected groups
- (d) charitable and welfare organizations
- (e) organizations of the people of the same nationality or background.
- (f) sports and recreational organizations
- (g) political clubs or organizations
- (h) neighborhood groups (community leagues)
- (i) others----------------------------------(specify)

(2) How often have you attended meetings of any of these groups in the last three months ?

- (a) once a week or more often
- (b) 2 - 3 times a month
- (c) once a month
- (d) 6 - 8 times a year
- (e) 2 - 4 times a year

(f) once a year

(g) rarely

(h) nenver

Part II

This second part deals with the division of labor and decision making in families.

(3) We would like to know how you and your husband/wife divide up some of the family tasks. Here is a list of different tasks. Please read the questions and check in the appropriate column to indicate who does each task in your house.

1 - Husband always
2 - Husband more than wife
3 - Husband and wife exactly the same
4 - Wife more than the husband
5 - Wife always
6 - Not applicable

Household Tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6
(a) who does the grocery shopping ?						
(b) who gets the family breakfast on work days ?						
(c) who does the evening dishes						

(d) who straightens up the living room when company is coming ?						
(e) who mows the lawn ?						
(f) who shovels the sidewalks?						
(g) who repairs things around the house ?						
(h) who keeps track of the money and bills ?						
(i) who takes care of the children ?						
(j) who disciplines the children ?						

(4) In every family somebody has to decide such things as where the family will live and so on. Many couples think such things over first, but the final decision has to be made by the husband or wife or both. Please read each of the questions and check the appropriate column to indicate who finally decides each problem.

1 - Husband always
2 - Husband more than wife
3 - Husband and wife exactly the same
4 - Wife more than the husband
5 - Wife always
6 - Not applicable

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6
(a) who finally makes the decision about what car to buy ?						
(b) ... about whether or not to buy life insurence ?						
(c) ... about what house or apartment to buy or rent ?						
(d) ... about what job your husband/wife should take ?						

(e) ... about whether or not you should go to work or quit work ?							
(f) ... about how much money your family can afford to spend per week on food ?							
(g) ... about what doctors to have when some one is sick?							
(h) ... about where to go on a holiday ?							
(i) ... about how to spend the leisure time in the family ?							

(5) Families keep track of money and bills in many different ways. In some families, the husband handles it all, in others the wife does it and in others both the husband and wife handle that matter together. How did you happen to work it out the way you do in your family ?

(6) Can you recall the last time you and your husband/wife had a disagreement over money ?

yes ---- no ----

(a) what happened?

(b) what did you do ?

(c) do you always do the same ?

(d) what else do you do ?

(7) When there is a really important decision about which you two are likely to disagree, what happens?

1. Always
2. Usually
3. About half of the time
4. Seldom
5. Never

	1	2	3	4	5
(a) the wife gives in					
(b) husband gives in					
(c) neither will giv[illegible]					
(d) both would come to a compromise					
(e) do not differ					

(8) why is it so ?

(9) When you have had a bad day do you tell your husband/ wife about your troubles?

(a) always

(b) usually

(c) about half the time

(d) seldom

(e) never

(10) Why did you say that you -------------tell him/her?

(11) Thinking of marriage in general which of the five things would you say is the most valuable part of your marriage?

(a) husband providing for the family well and taking care of the wife and children.

(b) wife taking care of husband, children and home.

(c) companionship in doing things together.

(d) husbad and wife being equally responsible for the family.

(e) mutual understanding of each others ambitions, problems and feelings.

(12) Why do you think so ?

PART III

This section deals with your satisfaction with work and marriage.

(13) How satisfied are you with your work? (place an 'x' on the scale line which best describes the degree of happiness.)

very unhappy happy very happy

1--------------------------50--------------------100

(14) How satisfied are you with your marriage? (place an 'x' on the sacle line which best describes the degree of happiness.)

very unhappy happy very happy

1-------------------------50--------------------100

Part IV

This section deals with your opinion to some of the statements that are relevant to families.

(15) We would like to know your opinion towards each of these statements. Opinions differ and your own view is as good as that of anybody else. Choose the response column for each of these statements, which would best express your feelings and check these to indicate your attitudes to that statement.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

	1	2	3	4	5
(a) If there is a difference of opinion the husband should decide finally where to live.					
(b) The wife's opinion should carry as much weight as husbands in money matters.					

(c) The husband should be the "boss" of the house.						
(d) The wife should be as well informed as the husband concerning the family financial status, and business affairs.						
(e) Almost all money matters should be decided by the husband.						
(f) The husband and wife should have equal privileges in such things as going out at night.						
(g) The husband and wife should have equal say in decisions affecting the familiy as a whole.						

(h) The wife should fit her life to her husband's.					
(i) Managing and planning for spending should be a joint proposition between husband and wife.					
(j) The parents should permit their children to share according to their abilities with the parents in making family decisions.					
(k) The husband should make most of the decisions concerning the children such as where they will go and what they may do.					

PART V

This last part deals with background information on you to help us describe the families we are studying.

(16) Were you born in Canada ?

yes no

(17) (if not born in Canada) How many years back did you come to Canada? years.

(18) Are you employed now?

yes no

(19) Have you worked since your marriage?

(a) yes (i) full time

(ii) part time

(b) no

(20) How long have you worked altogether since your marriage?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 years

(21) Have you worked since having children ?

(a) yes (i) full time

(ii) part time

(b) no

(22) Did you work when your children were pre-schoolers?

(a) yes (i) full time

(ii) part time

(b) no

(23) What is your present occupation?

(24) How many hours do you usually work in a week ?

(25) How much pay do you receive in one year ?

$ 3,000 - 4,999

$ 5,000 - 6,999

$ 7,000 - 8,999

$ 9,000 - 10,999

$11,000 - 12,999

$13,000 - 14,999

$15,000 - 16,999

$17,000 - 18,999

$19,000 - 20,999

(26) (for men) Do you have any other part time job ?

(for women) Do you take in any work at home for which you are paid (such as baby-sitting, typing, ironing,etc.

(a) yes specify

(b) no

(27) On an average, how much money do you make from this in a year ? $

(28) What is your age at your last birthday ?

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 years
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 years
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 years

(29) What is the highest grade of school you have completed?

Grade 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

(30) (if college) How many years of college did you complete?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 years

APPENDIX - V

THE GAME

The general method of the decision making problem was to engage the couple in an actual decision making session and to observe and record the behavior of the spouses. Each couple was asked to assume that it had received a gift of 300 dollars and the couple was then asked to decide between themselves how the money should be spent. Certain restrictions were imposed on the use of the money to assure that the couples were in fact confronted with a new problem that inspired discussion and interaction. Couples were told that the money could not be saved nor could it be used for items they previously planned to purchase or were committed to purchase.

The decision making problem used was a "full-fledged" rather than a "truncated" problem. Required was orientation or some interaction in order to establish a common definition of the problem. Spouses possessed somewhat different values or interests and the task demanded arriving at common value judgments. Thus, the problem of evaluation was unsolved at the beginning of the observation. Finally the task involved pressure for a joint decision in as much as the couples realized that they were expected to produce a list of items to be purchased with the gift money.

APPENDIX VI

BALES INTERACTION PROCESS CATEGORIES

Categories	Score
1. Shows solidarity,raises other's status, gives help,reward:	
2. Shows tension release,jokes,laughs, shows satisfaction :	
3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands,concurs,complies:	
4. Gives suggestion,direction,implying autonomy for other:	
5. Gives opinion, evaluvation, analysis,expressses feeling,wish:	
6. Gives Orientation, information, repeats,clarifies,cofirms:	
7. Asks for orientation,information, repetition,confirmation:	

8. Asks for opinion,evaluvation, analysis, expression of feeling:	
9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action:	
10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help:	
11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field:	
12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self:	

APPENDIX VII

PRE-TEST

(1) Who do you think will make most of the final decisions about spending the money?

(a) I will probably make most of the final decisions.
(b) I will probably make somewhat more of the final decisions.
(c) We will probably make about the same number of final decisions.
(d) He/she will probably make somewhat more of the final decisions.
(e) He/she will probably make most of the final decisions.

(2) Whose wishes do you expect to be reflected mostly in final decisions?

(a) My wishes will probably be mostly reflected in final decisions.
(b) My wishes will probably be reflected somewhat more in final decisions.
(c) The wishes of both of us will equally be reflected in final decisions.

(d) His/her wishes will probably be reflected somewhat more in final decisions.

(e) His/her wishes will probably be mostly reflected in final decisions.

(3) Who do you expect to do most of the talking while deciding to spend money?

(a) I will probably do most of the talking.

(b) I will probably do somewhat more talking.

(c) We both will probably do about the same amount of talking.

(d) He/she will probably do somewhat more talking.

(e) He/she will probably do most of the talking.

(4) Who would you expect to contribute most of the ideas and suggestions?

(a) I will probably contribute most of the ideas and suggestions.

(b) I will probably contribute somewhat more of the ideas and suggestions.

(c) We both will probably contribute the same number of ideas and suggestions.

(d) He/she will probably contribute somewhat more of the the ideas and suggestions.

(e) He/she will probably contribute most of the ideas and suggestions.

(5) Who do you expect will do more to keep the session going smoothly?

(a) I will probably do the most to keep the session running smoothly.

(b) I will probably do somewhat more to keep the session running smoothly.

(c) We both will probably do the same amount to keep the session running smoothly.

(d) He/she will probably do somewhat more to keep the session running smoothly.

(e) He/she will probably do the most to keep the session running smoothly.

APPENDIX VIII

THE GAME AS EXPLAINED TO COUPLES

Now, this is the fun part of the study. Here, I just want to know how you respond to a situation. I would like to record this session so that I can use it later.

I would like you to assume that you both have won the second prize, in the Sweepstakes of Lipton Soup Company and I have come tonight to convey the happy news to you and to deliver this envelope containing the prize money you have won. I don't know how much money there is in the envelope. You will have to count it. Before you can claim this money actually, you have to pass a skill test. The test is that you should decide how to spend this money in 30 minutes and report to me. This money will be taken back if you don't decide how to spend it in the next 30 minutes.

Now I am leaving the house, you can start deciding how to spend the money you have won. You can ask me if you need any further clarifications. Please do not disturb the tape recorder. I will come back and pick it up after 30 minutes.

APPENDIX IX

RULES

Here are the rules for you to follow while making decisions for spending the money you have won:

(1) Both of you have to assume that you have won a second prize in the Sweepstakes of Lipton Soup Company.

(2) You have to decide between yourselves how the money should be spent.

(3) You have 30 minutes to decide the items on which you want to spend this money.

(4) This money cannot be saved.

(5) You cannot use this money for items you previously planned to purchase, or are committed to purchase.

(6) You cannot pay off things you have already bought.

(7) You cannot use this money to pay off loans.

(8) You must produce a statement as to how this money will be spent.

(9) You both are requested to speak in English throughout this session.

APPENDIX X

POST-TEST

Now that you have decided how to spend the money you have won . . . .

(1) Who do you think has made most of the final decisions about spending the money?

(a) I probably made most of the final decisions.

(b) I probably made somewhat more of the final decisions.

(c) We probably made about the same number of final decisions.

(d) He/she probably made somewhat more of the final decisions.

(e) He/she probably made most of the final decisions.

(2) Whose wishes do you think were reflected mostly in final decisions?

(a) My wishes are probably reflected mostly in final decisions.

(b) My wishes are reflected somewhat more in final decisions.

(c) The wishes of both of us were equally reflected in final decisions.

(d) His/her wishes were probably somewhat more reflected in final decisions.

(e) His/her wishes were probably mostly reflected in final decisions.

(3) Who do you think did most of the talking?

(a) I probably did most of the talking.

(b) I probably did somewhat more talking.

(c) We both probably did about the same amount of talking.

(d) He/she probably did somewhat more talking.

(e) He/she did most of the talking.

(4) Which one of you do you think contributed more ideas and suggestions?

(a) I probably contributed most of the ideas and suggestions.

(b) I probably contributed somewhat more of the ideas and suggestions.

(c) We both probably contributed about the same number of ideas and suggestions.

(d) He/she probably contributed somewhat more ideas and suggestions.

(e) He/she probably contributed most of the ideas and suggestions.

(5) Which one of you did the most, to keep the session going smoothly ?

(a) I probably did the most, to keep the session running smoothly.

(b) I probably did somewhat more, to keep the session running smoothly.

(c) We both probably did the same amount, to keep the session running smoothly.

(d) He/she probably did somewhat more, to keep the session running smoothly.

(e) He/she probably did the most, to keep the session running smoothly.

(6) How far are you satisfied with the decisions made?

(a) Very much satisfied.

(b) Satisfied.

(c) Undecided.

(d) Unsatisfied.

(e) Very much unsatisfied.

(7) Why did you say that . . . . made most of the final decisions?

(8) Is this typical of the manner in which you usually make financial decisions in your family? why?

. . . . YES . . . . NO